





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Boston Public Library

THE
Boston Public Library
QUARTERLY

T H E
Boston Public Library
QUARTERLY

VOLUME XII

1960



PUBLISHED BY THE TRUSTEES
Boston, Massachusetts

Z 881
.B75 B84

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Articles	
ALEXANDER THE GREAT, THE LEGEND OF	89
CHILD, LYDIA MARIA, AND THE INDIANS	51
COPLEY, JOHN SINGLETON, TO HIS WIFE	67
EHRlich COLLECTION, THE VIRGINIA AND RICHARD	103
FOURIERISM AND THE FOUNDING OF BROOK FARM	79
GUINEY, LOUISE I., ON AMERICAN WOMAN POETS	110
HEINTZELMAN, ARTHUR W., ETCHINGS AND DRAWINGS OF	115
PALESTINE, PILGRIMAGES TO	37
QUEBEC, BICENTENNIAL OF THE SIEGE OF	3
TAYLOR, EDWARD, ON THE LORD'S SUPPER	22
UTRECHT BOOK OF HOURS, A	97
WOOD-ENGRAVING IN AMERICA, MODERN	57

Notes on Rare Books and Manuscripts

BOOK OF HOURS FROM VRELANT'S WORKSHOP, A	121
HAWTHORNE, MRS., ON DICKENS	120

Illustrations

“ALEXANDER THE GREAT” (STRASSBURG, 1493), FRONTISPIECE OF	91
HEINTZELMAN, ARTHUR W., “VALAISON,” AN ETCHING BY	117
LEIGHTON, CLARE, “THE HERB GATHERERS,” A WOODCUT BY	59
TUCHER, HANS, “EIN UNTERRICHTUNG,” (STRASSBURG, 1484), FRONTISPIECE OF	41

THE
Boston Public Library
QUARTERLY

Volume 12, Number 1

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
BICENTENNIAL OF THE SIEGE OF QUEBEC <i>By Ellen M. Oldham</i>	3
EDWARD TAYLOR ON THE LORD'S SUPPER <i>By Norman S. Grabo</i>	22
PILGRIMAGES TO PALESTINE <i>By Edith A. Wright</i>	37
LYDIA MARIA CHILD AND THE INDIANS <i>By Lloyd C. Taylor, Jr.</i>	51
MODERN WOOD-ENGRAVING IN AMERICA <i>By Arthur W. Heintzelman</i>	57
ILLUSTRATIONS	

* * *

EDITOR: ZOLTÁN HARASZTI

The Boston Public Library Quarterly is published for January, April, July and October by the Trustees of the Public Library of the City of Boston in Copley Square, Boston 17. Entered as second-class matter at Boston, Massachusetts. Printed at the Boston Public Library in January 1960.

Single Copies, 50 cents
Annual Subscription, \$2.00

THE Boston Public Library QUARTERLY

JANUARY 1960

Bicentennial of the Siege of Quebec

By ELLEN M. OLDHAM

ON September 12, 1959, was celebrated the two-hundredth anniversary of the Battle of the Plains of Abraham, below the walls of Quebec. One of the decisive engagements of history, it has been called "the crowning battle in the long struggle between England and France for supremacy in North America." In commemoration of this event, it may be of interest to survey the original material available in the rich collections of the Boston Public Library.

The central item of the group must be the Orderly Book kept by Captain Alcock, containing the General Orders issued by General James Wolfe from the inception of the campaign on May 6, 1759, until his death—and then continuing through the winter until May 18 of the following year. It is a volume of 86 leaves, measuring 8 by 5½ inches. Although the latest entry is dated 1762, there is a note on the back fly-leaf: "Captain Alcock's Book the 24th July 1767." While this officer has not been definitely identified, he was probably the William Alcock who was made a Captain in the 52d Regiment in May 1765. To be sure, the 52d Regiment did not take part in the Siege of Quebec; yet Alcock may have served earlier in another regiment.

Wolfe's General Orders have been printed several times.

Yet even the rarest printed book cannot have the flavor of such a little volume as this, which has been through the very thick of the fight. A similar Orderly Book, once the property of George Allsopp, Secretary to Colonel Guy Carleton, Wolfe's Quartermaster, was published in its entirety by the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec in 1875. It agrees in most points with ours; its greater detail indicates that it was used at a somewhat lower level of command. One difference is that the Boston Public Library manuscript lists the Field Officer for each day, whereas Allsopp's book omits this item but invariably notes the posting of the various pickets and guards. A close comparison of our manuscript with the printed volume also reveals variations in wording and spelling due, in some instances at least, either to error on Allsopp's part or to difficulty in transcribing his handwriting.

Supplementing Alcock's manuscript is Captain John Knox's *An Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North-America, for the years 1757, 1758, 1759, and 1760* (London, 1769), in two volumes, large quartos. Generally considered to be the most authoritative of the contemporary journals and accounts of the Quebec expedition, the work was reprinted by the Champlain Society in 1914-16, with a third volume containing notes and related material. Little is known of the early life of John Knox, an Irishman who, in 1741, purchased a lieutenancy in the 43d Regiment. He participated in the American engagements of which he writes—the expeditions against Louisbourg and Quebec. Then he was appointed Captain of the 99th Foot, but after the disbandment of the regiment in 1763 he was retired at half-pay. Although he later commanded a company of Invalids, Knox never received the recognition he thought he deserved; he died, a disappointed man, in 1778.

It was during the period of his retirement that Captain Knox prepared for the press his *Journal* which was published by subscription, the majority of the subscribers being Irishmen. The author explains the delay of publication in his introduction:

Accounts of transactions, in which the Writer has borne any

part, are generally drawn with so evident a design of making him "*The Heroe of the Tale*," that they have been called in the just severity of wit, "*The Histories of Man's Importance in his own Eyes*."

Alarmed at a prepossession so dangerous, I have thus long suppressed the following work, written mostly at the time, and finished almost as soon as the events it contains. But upon cooler reflection, conscious innocence of a self sufficiency so justly disgusting, and from all pretensions to which I was precluded by my situation, has encouraged me to lay it now before the Public.

Knox supplemented his personal observations with reports from other officers and, above all, from Orderly Books and authentic accounts received from Sir Jeffrey Amherst, Colonel William Amherst, and General Williamson of the Royal Artillery.

FROM the days of the earliest colonies in the New World, there was rivalry between the French and English; yet the final outcome was inevitable. Motivated primarily by missionary endeavors, in contrast to the commercial interests of the English, the French colonists were scattered through the wilderness rather than clustering in cities, and their numbers remained far below those of their rivals. In 1748 the French in Canada numbered 80,000 and the English, one million. The eighteenth century saw a constant succession of armed conflicts between France and England in Europe; at the same time there were innumerable skirmishes in the New World. In 1745 Governor Shirley of Massachusetts besieged and captured Louisbourg; in 1748 the fort was returned to France by the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle; in 1755 General Braddock, in an advance on Fort Duquesne, was ambushed and routed by the French and their Indian allies.

The year 1756 marks the start of the maneuvers which made General Wolfe famous, and which culminated in the battle of Quebec. In May of that year war was formally declared between the two nations, and the Marquis de Montcalm was sent to take charge of the French forces in Canada, with headquarters in Quebec. His opponent was at first Lord Loudon, but he was soon replaced by General James Abercrombie,

with General Sir Jeffrey Amherst as his chief aide. Amherst arrived at Halifax in May of 1758, at the head of fourteen battalions, accompanied by a fleet of twenty-two ships of the line, fifteen frigates, and one hundred and twenty transports, under Admiral Boscawen. With Amherst was also the thirty-one-year-old Brigadier-General James Wolfe. By the end of the year Wolfe had recaptured Louisbourg, and General John Forbes had taken Fort Duquesne, renaming it Fort Pitt. Objectives for the next year were to be the seizure of Fort Ticonderoga and Quebec. Amherst was assigned the first, and Wolfe the second—his first independent command.

Born in January 1727 of a military family, James Wolfe was a professional soldier of the finest type. He was appointed an ensign at the age of fourteen and rose rapidly in rank. Though physically frail, he never used ill health as an excuse for laxness, and expected his officers and men to follow his standards. Nine years after his death, in 1768, John Millan, a London publisher, printed *General Wolfe's Instructions to Young Officers . . .*, which included also most of the Regimental and General Orders which Wolfe issued between December 1748, in Scotland, and September 12, 1759, immediately preceding his death at Quebec. The introductory paragraph is a fine summary of Wolfe's own attitude towards his career:

When a young gentleman betakes himself to the profession of arms, he should seriously reflect upon the nature and duties of the way of life he has entered into, and consider, that it is not as the generality of people vainly imagine, learning a little of the exercise, saluting gracefully, firing his platoon in his turn, mounting a few guards (carelessly enough) and finally, exposing his person bravely in the day of battle; which will deservedly, and in the opinion of the judges, acquire him the character of a good officer: no, he must learn chearfully to obey his superiors, and that their orders and his own be punctually executed.

The first orders of the Quebec campaign were issued at Halifax, May 4, 1759. In them Wolfe listed the officers who were to serve directly under him, and the forces which would be engaged in the struggle. There were to be three brigades, consisting of ten regiments, supported by three companies

of grenadiers, three companies of light infantry, and six companies of rangers. The entire force numbered 384 officers, 411 non-commissioned officers, and 7,740 soldiers. To transport and back up the land forces, General Wolfe had been assigned a fleet of 170 ships manned by 18,000 seamen. On the 6th of May, still under the date-line of Halifax, the first orders appear in the Library's manuscript:

As the Fleet sails from Louisbourg in three Divisions, the first Brigade is the White Division, the second, the Red Division, the third, the Blue Division. The Grenadiers of Louisbourg, and the Rangers are to be appointed to one or other of these Divisions. If the Regiments have time to put a quantity of spruce beer into their transports it would be of great service to their men. Weak and sickly men are not to embark with their Regiments. Measure will be taken to bring those people to the Army as soon as they are perfectly recovered.

The following few days brought instructions for the impending voyage, ending on May 10 with the hopeful note: "The troops are to embark, as soon after the arrival of the transports as they conveniently can, and as they are many more ships than will be wanted (if they all arrive) they are to have a good allowance of tunnage."

By the 12th most of the men and baggage were on board, and on May 17th came the first orders at Louisbourg. This was only a temporary stop, but while waiting in the harbor the men were to be furnished with as much fresh meat and provisions as could be procured—Captain Knox, in his *Journal*, added the remark that provisions were "immoderately dear in this place; beef and mutton from twelve to fifteen pence per pound." But on June 1 came word—to quote our *Orderly Book*—"The troops to land no more, the flat bottomed boats to be hoisted in that the ships may be ready to sail at the first signal. When three guns are fired from the salutary battery all officers are to repair on board."

Among the last-minute instructions one notes that "the regiments are to receive provisions for no more than three women per company of seventy men, and four women per company of one hundred men each." These women served as sutlers and cooks. Progress up the St. Lawrence was

slow, because unfamiliarity with the river made constant soundings necessary. Yet the master of one of the transports remarked (as recorded by Knox) that he esteemed "the St. Lawrence to be the finest river, the safest navigation, with the best anchorage in it, of any other within his knowledge; that it is infinitely preferable to the Thames or the Rhone . . ."

A sidelight of this trip appears in a manuscript affidavit in the Chamberlain Collection of the Library. John Knox noted, on June 20th, that as the fleet "came abreast of Tadousac, we incountered the strongest rippling current I ever saw; it runs nine or ten knots in an hour, and, at the same time, the wind dying away, drove back some of our transports, and many of them luckily escaped falling foul of each other, particularly of the smaller craft." In December 1759, as a direct result of this occurrence, action was brought in Suffolk County court against one Benjamin Parrott. The affidavit in the Library offered in his defence reads in part:

We the Subscribers being passengers on board the Sloop *Charming Nancy*, Benj. Parrott Master, from Louisbourg on the Expedition against Quebeck and coming to an Ankor on the 20th Day of June in the River St. Lawrence to stop a tide. After the Said Parrotts Ankor was down and his Sails haul'd down & the Vessell brought up by the Cable, a Schooner call'd Nicholson's just ahead of us Loaded with Cattle was hauling down her fore-Sail in order to Ankor, at which Said Parrott seeing, called to them not to let go their Ankor there for if they did they would be fould of us, at which they on board the Schooner said put your helm a Port & we shall lay well, at which Said Parrott told them several times over that when the strength of the tide came & their Schooner should start her Ankor that she would carry us a Drift with them, which came to pass in about two hours after. . .

The cables of the two vessels were indeed tangled, and the *Charming Nancy* was dragged after the schooner until they approached another vessel so close that Captain Parrott was forced to cut his anchor cable to avoid collision.

At last, on June 26th, Captain Deane was ordered to range the transports along the shore of the Isle of Orleans and land the following morning. Wolfe's instructions for setting

up camp were, as always, specific. Because of the heat of the Canadian summer, there should be no more than 5 men to a tent, "or if the Commanding Officer likes it better, and have camp equipage enough they may order only 4." The larger regiments were to encamp in double rows of tents. The men were immediately put to work, with strict orders to refrain from "stragglng any distance from the camp on any account whatsoever." The base camp was set up at the western end of the Isle of Orleans, with Brigadier Monckton occupying Point Levis, across the channel and nearly opposite Quebec itself. On July 9 a further move was made, and the brigades of General Murray and General Townshend crossed to the gorge of the Montmorenci River.

Shortly before this maneuver, General Wolfe announced to the troops his aim and the means whereby he intended to carry it out:

The object of the campaign is to compleat the conquest of Canada and to finish the war in America. The army under the Commander in Chief [Amherst] will enter into the colony on the side Montreal while the fleet and army here attack the Governor General [Montcalm] and his forces. Great sufficiency of provisions and a numerous artillery is provided and from the known valour of the troops the nation expects success. These battallions have acquired reputation in the last campaign and it is not doubted but they will be carefull to preserve this confidence. The General has assured the Secretary of State in his letters that whatever may be the event of the campaign His Majesty and the country will have reason to be satisfied with the army under his command.

Wolfe went on to say that he expected his men to "work chearfully and diligently without the least unsoldier like murmer or complaint and that his few but necessary orders strictly obeyed." The out-guards must be vigilant—"any officer or non commissioned officer who suffers himself to be surprised by the enemy must not expect to be forgiven"; yet "false alarms are hurtfull in an army and dishonorable to those who occasion them." No churches, houses, or other buildings were to be destroyed without orders; and those farmers who remained in their habitations were not to be molested. Care should be taken that no rum or other

"spiritous Liquors of any Kind" be sold in or near the camps.

Orders for the following days detailed the position of the various units at the Montmorenci camp and the location of artillery batteries. While this work was going on, there was constant danger from enemy bands. The outposts and working parties were ordered to "fortify themselves in the best manner they can," by forming breastworks of branches in such a way that "a small party will be able to defend themselves till succour arrives, or at least will give time for the troops to get under Arms." Realizing the necessity for securing the safety of the position as swiftly as possible, Wolfe still kept in mind the well-being of his troops. "The Troops must expect to meet with extraordinary Fatigues and as they go through them with alacrity and spirit the General will not be sparing of any refreshment as he thinks will conduce to the repairing them in health . . ."

ONCE the batteries were in place, there was constant shelling of Quebec. On July 16 the shells set fire to the great cathedral which, because of the strong wind, was entirely destroyed. But the French forces were by no means inactive. They returned the cannonading, while roaming bands of savages forced the English to be constantly on the alert. The orders of July 17 complimented a company of grenadiers "for the spirit they shewed this morning in pushing those scoundrels of Indians," rewarding them with two sheep and some rum. At the same time, General Wolfe warned his officers to proceed with caution "lest they should be drawn too far into the woods, and fall into an ambuscade." The constant harrassing of the guards and outposts, indeed, brought the order that all squadrons covering the working parties should be so organized that half the men should always have their arms ready, and none should be out of communication with the rest; at night, two sentries were to be posted together.

The General Orders continued to provide for shifts of the men from one post to another as the maneuvers demanded; but these strictly military matters are lightened by bits of

homely advice. Some characteristic ones may be quoted:

The commanding officers of corps are to take care to prevent the soldiers from destroying the parapet by taking out the timber to burn when wood is wanting. . .

As fresh straw cannot be conveniently got for the troops it is recommended to the Commanding Officers to direct the cutting spruce boughs for that purpose. . .

Great care to be taken by the Regts. within their respective encampments & in the neighbourhood that all offals with every thing which might taint the air be buried deep under ground and the General recommends it in the strongest manner to Commanding Officers of Corps to have their camp kept sweet and clean. . .

The General strictly forbids the inhuman practice of scalping except when the enemy are Indians or Canadians dressed like Indians. . .

Yet, in spite of all the notices that "the troops are to be ready to turn out at 5 o'clock," that "the Regiments are to be under arms this afternoon . . .," and so on, one receives from this Orderly Book little notion of what was really taking place in the field—or on the river. During the latter part of July a number of vessels, including the battle-ship *Sutherland*, sailed up the St. Lawrence past Quebec, which proved that this could be safely done, and thus forced Montcalm to extend his forces further along the banks. On several occasions the French attempted a counter-attack against the English fleet by means of fire-ships; bombardments were frequent on both sides. For all such details one must turn to Captain Knox's great journal. Yet one gets tantalizing hints of important maneuvers from our manuscript. On July 29th it records:

The Regiments to be under arms this afternoon at 3 o'clock at the head of their encampments and to remain there til sent for to their respective alarm posts, the rest of the Lt. infantry returns this night from the Isle of Orleans to the camp at Montmorenci. Col. How will take his former post, Anstruthers, Otways, & Lascells will encamp on their proper ground. . . The Regiments are not to call in their working parties this evening as they must exert themselves to finish the business of this post that further operations may take place.

On July 31 a picket of the 35th Regiment was ordered to march immediately to the left of the camp, and one of the

17th Regiment to the redoubt. One could hardly be expected to guess from these lines that a major engagement was in prospect! But on the morrow of the attack—known as the Battle of Montmorenci—both rebukes and compliments were in order:

The check which the Grenadiers met with yesterday will it is to be hoped be a lesson to them for the time to come. Such impetuous irregular and unsoldierlike proceeding destroys all order and makes it impossible for their commander to form a disposition for an attack and puts it out of the General's power to execute his plan. The Grenadeers could not suppose that they alone could beat the French army, therefore it was necessary that the Corps under Brigadiers Monctons and Townsend should have time to joyn that the attack might be general. The very first fire of the enemy was sufficient to have repulsed men who had lost all sence of order and military discipline.

Amhursts & the Highland alone by the soldierlike manner they were formed in would undoubtedly have beat back the whole Canadian Army if they ventured to attack them. The loss, however is inconsiderable and may be easily repaired when a favourable opportunity offers if men will shew proper attention to their officers. . .

The ill-timed though enthusiastic charge of the Grenadiers upon a French redoubt, without waiting for reinforcements coming along the beach, may well have been due in part to the long hours of boredom the men had spent in their transports half-way across the river. The total losses on the French side were 66 killed and wounded, while the British lost 420 men and 30 officers.

The month of August was spent in feigned attacks to draw out the French and inflict damage upon them, in laying waste the country-side and destroying supplies, in continued shelling of the city itself, much of which was reduced to ruins. One of the few orders which appear in Alcock's manuscript, and apparently not elsewhere, comes from this period—"The General has occasion for 2 subalterns 2 serjeants and 40 volunteers from the line for a particular service. Any of the above who choses to offer themselves must give in their names to the Adjutant immediately." These men, it appears, were to accompany Brigadier General Murray who, on

August 5, led a force of 1,200 men up the river, to assist Rear-Admiral Holmes in the destruction of the French ships and open communications with General Amherst.

It may have been true that the English soldiers were too eager for action; Wolfe, on August 11, again had to issue a severe reprimand:

The General was extremely surprised to see the disorder that seemed to have run thro the working party this morning and foresees if a Stop is not immediately put to such unsoldierlike proceedings that they may have very dangerous consequences. The men fired this day upon one another, fired upon the Lt. Infantry and were scattered in such a manner that a few resolute people would have easily defeated them. It is therefore ordered that when there is an alarm of this kind every soldier shall remain at his post til ordered to march by the proper Officer. . .

The cause of the excitement had been a band of Indians, discovered creeping up toward the men cutting fascines in the woods. Such enemy parties were frequent:

When a small party of Volunteers of any Regiment are inclined to lay in wait durement the night for the small reconitring parties the Enemy may push towards the Camp the General will give them leave to try it and if any soldier kills an Indian or takes him alive which is still more difficult he shall be handsomely rewarded. . .

In the latter part of August General Wolfe fell ill of a fever and for some days was unable to carry on his duties. During this time Brigadier Murray returned with his men and joined Moncton and Townshend in considering three plans, submitted by Wolfe from his sickbed, for an all-out attack on the French and, after rejecting these, to prepare for the joint operaion which was finally decided upon. The intricate maneuvering began with the orders for September 1:

Monctons Regiment is to embark this night at 9 o'clock; the Commanding Officer is to come to Head Quarters this afternoon at 4 o'clock for his Orders. The Regiments and Corps to embark their sick, wounded, women and heavy baggage this morning at 11 o'clock.

On September 2:

The tents of all the Corps are to be struck this evening when

dark and carried down to the Beach under Anstruthers Regiment. There will be a boat assigned to each Corps to carry them off. These boats must be unloaded at Point Levi before high water that they may return with the ebb. . . The troops are to march and Embark for Point Levi tomorrow morning. . .

After the troops' removal from the Montmorenci camp, the next step began—marching past the city to a point up the river from which an attack might be made. On September 7 Wolfe was "On Board the Sutherland," and the following day "At Anchor off Cape Rouge." Orders for the succeeding days are mostly occupied with directions for loading and unloading the men on transports or flat-bottomed boats, and with various feints intended to confuse the enemy. But a final effort could not longer be delayed. It was on September 9 that Wolfe made his famous discovery of the Anse (cove) du Foulon, which hid a path seemingly so impracticable of ascent that the French had only a single picket to guard it. His last orders, given "At Anchor off Cape Rouge 12th September," are quoted in full:

The Enemys Forces are now devided. Great Scarcity of Provisions in their Camp and an universal discontent among the Canadians. The Officer in Command is gone to Montreal or St. Johns which gives reason to think that General Amhurst is advancing into the Colony. A vigorous blow struck at this Junture may determine the fate of Canada. Our Troops below are ready to joyn us, all the Light Infantry and Tools are embarked at Point Levi and the Troops will land where the Enemy least expect it.

The first Body that gets on shore are to march directly to the Enemy and drive them from any little post they may occupy. The Officers must be careful that the succeeding Bodies do not by any mistake fire on those who go before them.

The Battallions must form themselves on the uper Ground with expedition and be ready to charge what ever presents itself. When the Artillery and the Troops are landed a Corps will be left to secure the Landing place while the rest march on and endeavour to bring the French and Canadians to Battle.

The officers and soldiers will remember what their country expects from them and what a determined Body of Soldiers innured to war are capable of doing against 5 weak Battallions mingled with disorderly Peasantry. Soldiers must be obedient to their Officers and in the execution of their duty.

Fitting were these last words of an officer who never

shirked a duty; who, within twenty-four hours, lay dead on the Plains of Abraham, living just long enough to see his strategy vindicated and his forces victorious. Brigadier Monckton, too, was wounded and, as every schoolboy knows, Montcalm received a fatal wound as well. In tribute, the password on September 14 was "Wolfe," and the countersign, "England," the orders for the day were given by General Townshend:

The General Officers remaining fit to act take the earliest opportunity to express the praise which is due to the conduct and braveing of the Troops, and the Victory that attained it suficiently proves the superiority which this Army has over any number of such Troops as they engaged yesterday. They wish the person who lately commanded them survived so glorious a day and had this day been able to give the Troops their just encomiums. . .

Quebec capitulated on September 17; and with the orders for the 18th, announcing the "Fourm of Takeing possession of the Town," this section of Captain Alcock's Orderly Book comes to a close.

THE fall of Quebec aroused rejoicing in both England and the colonies. On October 16 Samuel Cooper preached before Governor Pownall and the General Court of Massachusetts *A Sermon* on a text from the 140th Psalm, "Thy Saints shall bless Thee: they shall speak of the Glory of thy Kingdom, and talk of thy Power: to make known to the Sons of Men his mighty Acts." After "glancing at some of the Dispensations of Heaven in Favour of the Church in general, the Protestant Interest, and the British Nation and it's dependencies," the minister turned to the recent event and confessed:

I find myself at a Loss for Words upon this memorable Occasion. . . We have received a Salvation from Heaven, greater perhaps than any since the Foundation of the Country—The Power of Canada is broken—It's Capital is reduced; and the British Banners float triumphant upon the Walls of Quebec.

He warmly eulogized both the army and its general:

No Difficulty has arisen in this arduous Service, superior to the Skill of the Leader; nor any Danger, great enough to quell the

Resolution and Ardor of the Troops: for they had One at their Head, who knew how to infuse something of his own Spirit into an Army. . .

That memorable Day, not only exhibited the Superiority of British Courage, but shewed a young British Commander, who had never before been at the Head of an Army, vanquishing by superiority of Skill, an experienced and successful General of France. . . He died to live in the Hearts of Britons, and especially in the Hearts of British Americans, who are so peculiarly interested in this Conquest. . .

October 25 was appointed a day of public thanksgiving. Andrew Eliot, pastor of the New North Church of Boston, preached for the occasion. Eliot, too, turned to the Psalms for text; and presented a summary of the British-American expeditions against the French since 1627. Once again, the preacher lamented Wolfe's untimely death, and, like Cooper, hoped that the new situation would bring a fresh opportunity to spread the Gospel among the Indians. The Boston Public Library has copies of both sermons.

It took time before the great news reached England. The Day of Thanksgiving was proclaimed there for November 29. The Benton Collection of the Library has a copy of *A Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving* printed for the occasion in London. The sixteen-page booklet included a collect for Morning Prayer which read in part:

. . . We acknowledge, with grateful Hearts, thy fatherly Goodness, in preserving our native Country from hostile Invasions; in delivering our distant Settlements from dangerous Attacks; in causing our Enemies to fly before us, both by Sea and Land; in breaking down their strong Holds, and laying their fenced Cities into Ruinous Heaps; in supporting our Allies against superior Force. . .

The Communion Service contained "A Prayer for our Enemies":

. . . Give Grace, we beseech thee, to our Adversaries in the present War, to see and confess and amend the injurious Behaviour of which they have been guilty, that so they may obtain Pardon from Thee. . .

The Library has also the Edinburgh edition of the *Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving*.

It was the death of Wolfe, rather than the victory over the French, that captured the popular fancy. There are four ballad broadsides in the Library, and, although W. C. Ford in his *Massachusetts Broad-sides* lists only one as contemporary, the fact that so many copies remain even in reprints shows the wide-spread appeal of the verses. One of the poems, "The Death of the Brave General Wolfe" (Ford, no. 1158), begins:

Come all you young men all, let nothing fright you,
Nor your objection make, nor let it delight you,
Let not your courage fail till after trial,
Let not your fancy move to the first denial.

and ends:

The French began to break their ranks in flight and flying,
WOLF seeming to revive whilst he lay dying,
He rous'd up his head where cannon rattl'd,
And to his army said, how goes the battle?

His Aid-de-camp repli'd, 'tis in our favor
Quebec and all her pride nothing can save her:
She falls into our hands with all her treasures,
O then repli'd brave WOLF, I die with pleasure.

The first biography of General Wolfe appeared the year after his death, a fulsome account by Sir John Pringle (1707-82) printed in London and reprinted at Boston. The author subtitled his work "The elogium of that renowned hero, attempted according to the rules of eloquence . . ." He devoted a page to consoling "the lovely Maid"—a Miss Luther—"to whom Choice, guided by Reason pointed out Wolfe as the deserving object of her affections." Pringle was a distinguished Scotch physician, President of the Royal Society, and at one time professor of metaphysics and moral philosophy at the Edinburgh University.

A curious book is the *Memoirs of the Life and Gallant Exploits of the Old Highlander, Serjeant Donald Macleod*. . . (London, 1791) by an anonymous writer. Macleod, after a childhood of considerable austerity, was enlisted in the army at the age of thirteen. He served in several Scottish regiments, and as a Serjeant of the 78th Highlanders, commanded by General Fraser, took part in the Battle of Quebec. While

his own wounds were being dressed, he heard of the death of General Wolfe:

It was, under this weight of actual suffering, and sympathetic sorrow, some consolation to the good old Serjeant, (for by this time he was seventy years of age,) that the tender which he made of his plaid, for the purpose of carrying the dying General to some convenient place off the field of action, was accepted. In Serjeant Macleod's plaid was General Wolfe borne by four grenadiers; and with General Wolfe's corpse, being now an invalid, he was sent home to Britain, in November, 1759, in a frigate of war. . .

A manuscript in the Prince Collection bears upon the results of the battle. It is a contemporary copy of a Memorial addressed by William Bollan, agent for the Massachusetts Bay Colony, to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, urging a more equitable distribution of the £200,000 granted by Parliament to compensate the provinces in North America for their "expenses in the levying, cloathing & pay of the troops they raised . . ." Bollan argued that the Massachusetts troops deserved far more than might seem at first glance, for they were detained at Louisbourg and Nova Scotia from the first of November 1759 to the first of May 1760. "This detention," he wrote, "became necessary by the taking of Quebec, which was garrison'd by the troops that otherwise would have relieved ours, and has brought upon the province an expence which the other colonies have done nothing to balance." He further contended that each colony should bear its proportion of the excess expense of raising troops over and above the sums granted for compensation—or "Massachusetts Bay will be left to bear upwards of five times as much of the surplus of expence as Virginia, which is at the same time certainly more able to bear this great loss."

The Library has the large-scale "Plan of Quebec" published in London in 1759, as also the "Authentic Plan of the River St. Laurence . . ." which originally appeared in *The Universal Magazine* for 1759. Thomas Jefferys's *The Natural and Civil History of the French Dominions in North and South America* (London, 1760) gives twelve pages to "an account of the siege and reduction of Quebec." The two maps relating

to this are, once more, the "Authentic Plan of the River St. Laurence . . ." and a slightly different "Plan of Quebec," showing in greater detail the customary fortifications of the approach by water. But the handsomest set of maps are to be found in Jefferys's *General Topography of North America* (London, 1768). They are: "An Exact Chart of the River St. Laurence, from Fort Frontenac to the Island of Anticosti . . ."; "An Authentic Plan of the River St. Laurence from Sillery to the Fall of Montmorenci, with the operations of the Siege of Quebec . . ."; "A Plan of Quebec"; and, finest of all, "A Correct Plan of the Environs of Quebec, and of the Battle fought on the 13th September 1759 . . ."

AFTER the taking of Quebec, no entry was made in Captain Alcock's Orderly Book until the next spring. Twenty-nine pages comprise the "Orders by Brigadier General Murray at Quebec from the 23rd April 1760 to the raising of the Siege." Murray had been appointed Governor and Commander of the troops left to garrison the city. The winter of 1759 was one of great suffering from cold and bad weather, intensified by lack of firewood and fresh provisions. At one time nearly half the men of whole regiments were unfit for duty. To add to the troubles, the French, under Chevalier de Lévis, were only waiting for the melting of the ice of the river to stage a counter-attack.

The first encounter took place on April 28, after the French army and fleet had met just above Quebec and Chevalier de Lévis had occupied the village of St. Foy. The English marched out on the Plains of Abraham, but, though they fought bravely, superior forces drove them back to the city. Of the 3,866 able-bodied soldiers whom Murray was able to command, over 1,100 were killed, wounded, or taken prisoner.

The French took advantage of their victory to entrench themselves before Quebec, and began preparing batteries to shell the city. Inside, the English were put to work reinforcing the defences. One constant problem was that of drunkenness—in spite of strict orders to dilute the rum with water and to prohibit any selling of liquor. On April 30 Murray had to threaten again.

The General is surprised to find that soldiers get drunk and render themselves incapable of Duty at this time, break into Houses & commit other irregularities, but he is resolved to do his duty and hang such as are guilty of those crimes which are of the most pernicious consequences to the Garrison.

As the siege wore on, the convalescents were required to have their weapons with them in the barracks, so as to be ready to turn out in case of an alarm; and on May 3 it was ordered that "no officer or soldier pulls of his cloaths dureing the night."

Finally on May 9 the frigate *Leostoff*, under Captain Deane, arrived beneath the walls and brought good news, promptly communicated to the troops:

The General takes the earliest Opportunity to inform his Garrison that a strong Squadron is at hand, that M. Conflans Fleet consisting of 24 Sail is today totaly Destroyed, a decent they made in Ireland has miscarried and that Fleet and Army are taken Prisoners and he does not doubt but both Officers and Soldiers will exert their utmost Vigour and Spirrit on the present Occasion in Order to put a finial period to the War in this part of the World.

However, the approach of the British fleet and the loss of hope for naval reinforcements of their own spurred the French to speed up their bombardment and take the city in a last desperate attempt. The English officers kept half of their men "always under arms upon the Ramparts at their Alarm posts, the remainder ready to turn out with their Arms in an instant."

On the evening of May 14 the warship *Vanguard*, with the frigate *Diana* and another armed ship, arrived and two days later sailed up river to attack the French squadron. This spelled the end of the French efforts. With the British fleet in command of the river, Chevalier de Lévis gave the orders to withdraw.

THE third section, of ten pages, is headed: "27th Decemb. 1761—Expedition against Martinico, Commander in Cheif. Majr. Genl. Moncton . . ." Many of the regiments which had taken part in the Quebec enterprise were now transferred to the West Indies, as the center of conflict shifted. Here

there is but one all-inclusive order, dated January 7, 1762, "to be read to the men on board each Transport the Evening before the Army Lands." Parts of it are quoted:

The Expedition is amply suplyed with provisions ammunition and stores of all kinds and they contracted for a large quantity of fresh provisions and a great number of Negros to draw the Cannon and nothing has been neglected that can in any shape contribute either to the health ease or convenience of the soldiers, the Genl is determind to prosecute the operations of the Campaigne with Spirit Vigour and is well convinced that the Troops will gallantly second him on all Occasions and execute his Orders with chearfullness and strict obedience and undergo the unaviteable fitagues of the Campaigne with that Resolution that strongly characterize the British Troops. . .

No firing out of the Boats; on Landing the Troops will fix their Bayonets as they fourm and attack any Body of the Enemy that dares to Oppose them; the succeeding Bodies will be very carefull not to fire on those who are landed; the Corps who happen to land where there are any eminencies must gain the sumits before they fourm; the General recommends coolness in those manouvers but greatly disaproves of hurrying the Troops—the Army under the fire and protection of the Fleet may be ordered to land in the face of the Enemy or the General may think it adviseable to attempt it in different parts of the Iseland to devide the Enemys force and succeed where they least expect it. . .

The last campaign to find a place in the Library's manuscript is recorded under the heading "1762. Expedition against the Havanna. Commandr. in Cheif the Right Honr. The Earl of Albemarle." Only the list of regiments involved in the action, with their commanders and the formation into brigades, is included. This siege was, of course, a leading factor in Spain's loss of power in the New World.

The final three pages of Alcock's Orderly Book consist of neatly drawn diagrams. The first is labeled "Siege of Louisbourg, Line of Battle, Gabarouse Bay 3d June 1758"; and the second (a two-page spread) is entitled "Siege of Quebec . . . Order of Encampment of the Army . . ."

Edward Taylor on the Lord's Supper

By NORMAN S. GRABO

HISTORY is in the process of reversing the off-hand judgment of Henry W. Taylor, Justice of the Supreme Court of New York, who wrote a hundred years ago that Edward Taylor, his Puritan progenitor, "cannot be said to have possessed a poetic genius of a very high order."¹ Modern readers will not discover how high the order of that poetic genius really was until they know far more about Taylor than is now known. The critical edition of Taylor's *Poems* (Yale, 1959) will certainly make possible a more accurate appraisal of the man and his work, but it would be unwise at this point to try to judge Taylor with any finality. In fact, before any such evaluation can be made, many of the easy assumptions implied in the semi-critical remarks of the past twenty years will need to be uprooted.

For example, it is evident that Taylor, a Congregational minister, found in theology, church polity, and the church community the subject, inspiration, and the occasion for practically all his poetry. Yet almost nothing has been done to show just what the religion behind Edward Taylor's poetry was. In 1939 Perry Miller, in *The New England Mind*, ranked him among the Federal theologians. That same year Thomas H. Johnson in his selection of Taylor's *Poetical Works* placed him as Miller did, but again without proof. In 1953 Donald E. Stanford insisted that Taylor did not subscribe to the Federal theology, but was an orthodox Calvinist, as if it were not possible to be both.² At this time he apparently had not examined several Taylor manuscripts which go far to clear up many questions of Taylor's religious position.

Perhaps the most crucial of Taylor's attitudes is that toward the Lord's Supper, which motivated so much of his poetry; and one convenient way to trace it is in his reaction to the controversy aroused by Solomon Stoddard of Northampton (1643-1729). Though they were nearly the same age, Stoddard had graduated from Harvard in 1662, six years before Taylor

came to New England, and during the latter's stay at Harvard was the librarian of the College. While Taylor was finishing his third and last year at school, Stoddard was being tested by the frontier congregation of Northampton, where he received a call and was ordained in 1672. By this time Taylor had also accepted a call from the frontier, arriving in Westfield late in 1671. So far as is known, both young men put into practice the conclusions of the Synod of 1662, the principles of the Half-Way Covenant, which baptized children of church members, but did not admit them to full communion or the Lord's Supper until after a public demonstration that they were truly regenerate.

But in 1677, Professor Miller tells us, Stoddard began to baptize "every adult who consented to the articles of faith, and admitted him to the Supper," thereby giving full support to the many who had been unable to accept the conclusions of the 1662 Synod. Miller's information, he writes, is from "the obvious sources,"³ but it is questionable that Stoddard had gone quite so far by this time, though he had publicized his desire to do so. There was, at least, no immediate response from Taylor, who was trying to determine the feasibility of bringing the Westfield community into a formal church state now that the immediate dangers of King Philip's War were over. But in Boston there was a reaction, for in 1677 Increase Mather, without naming Stoddard, preached to the General Court "A Discourse Concerning the Danger of Apostasy," attacking the doctrines espoused by Stoddard.

It was only under pressure that Stoddard fully elaborated these doctrines, and that not until 1709. What he objected to was that, according to the Half-Way Covenant, no man was permitted to partake of the Lord's Supper until he had certain knowledge of his salvation; without this knowledge, his attendance at the sacrament was damning. But no man could know he was saved with absolute certainty. The only safe course, then, was to admit all well-behaved Christians to the sacrament in hopes that it might secure them saving grace, that it might, in other words, convert them. Moreover, Stoddard argued, the present practice of bringing particular churches into existence by covenanting had the warrant of

neither scripture nor necessity. There he rested his case.

IN July of 1679 Taylor sent letters to the ministers of several neighboring communities, arranging for the public ceremony of Westfield's entering into a church state. On August 26 the ministers arrived, among them Stoddard, who had just come from the first of his five "harvests," demonstrating the efficacy of his methods by the great number of young people in Northampton he had brought to a concern for their salvation. He assumed the rôle of leadership at Westfield, as he was to do throughout the Connecticut valley, and on the following afternoon listened to Taylor preach a long sermon on Ephesians 2:22.

There is a holograph copy of this sermon, entitled "A Particular Church is Gods House", in the Prince Collection of the Boston Public Library.⁴ Taylor took occasion that afternoon in 1679 to hold forth for over two hours on the nature of a particular church and the sacraments, totally upholding the Half-Way Covenant and directly opposing Stoddard.⁵ The Prince copy is fairly legible, but the infinity of subdivisions remains an impediment to easy reading and signals the primary fault of the sermon. In trying to impress his colleagues, to stick to his text, and to attack Stoddard all at once, Taylor tried to do too much.

His attack is oblique. He begins by setting up a central image of the church as the super-structure of a building, gloriously rising from its foundation, which is Christ, and then states his doctrine: "A Particular Church of Christ is built up an Habitation of God thrô the Spirit." Hereupon he sets out four topics of consideration, only the first of which really interests him, "the Causes of a Particular Church." These he divides into "external" and "internal" causes, crowding the former into four packed pages, developing none of his subjects more than sketchily. He is more thorough concerning the latter—the matter and form of a particular church. Having indicated in the preceding argument that God's house should contain only pure utensils, he applies the same requirement to the matter—the church members—which he

declares must be really holy and visibly holy. The form, that which joins the matter together, is the covenant. He extends the consideration of these internal causes over fifty-one pages.

This is the core of the sermon, obviously aimed at Stoddard. The "Essentiall Qualification of the Matter for this building" is real holiness, Taylor begins, supporting himself with five propositions: (1) because if the universal church is holy, then so is the particular church, (2) because since all the matter is in a state of God's favor, it must therefore be holy before being set into the building, (3) because the superstructure must suit its foundation (Christ), which is holy, (4) because it is a holy person who dwells in this habitation, and (5) because the use to which the building is dedicated is holy.

But the holiness must be visible too, manifested first in "a Holy and Regular Life Conversation" or saintly behavior, and secondly "by an Holy and Regular Confession of the Same." To whom should this confession be made? Taylor pretends that there is no question: "I suppose none will deny but it is to be given to the Elders of the Church." Moreover, the confession should be made public, as he and six others had illustrated just before he began preaching. Taylor insists that "It is necessary that the Person seeking Church Fellowship with any Church of Christ, give an account of Some of his experiences that he hath had of the Workings of Gods Spirit upon his heart. . ." (p. 14). He proves from both Testaments that such relations had always been given to the church, and more significantly, that the confession must be made before admission. Then, turning from the Bible to "Humane Testimony evidencing the same," he reviews the first five centuries of the Christian era, concluding that "None are to be received and baptized into the Church but by a Previous Confession of faith and Repentance, according to the Custom of the primitive Church, and ours at present" (p. 25).

Having shown what may be seen in the example of others, he attempts to demonstrate the necessity of a public confession by still other arguments. First, the church has a duty to be faithful to the keys of Christ's kingdom. Secondly, such a

confession not only benefits others and gives glory to God, but rewards the soul that gives it, "For when the Soul Sees that an account of its experiences of Gods working upon it is to be given by it in Some measure as a Sign of his preparation for . . . a state of Full Communion, how intent will it make him in observing the motions of Gods Spirit upon him?" Finally, since such a relation is expected of censured persons seeking reinstatement, it seems a valid requirement for those seeking admission.

Then Taylor adds, almost as if it were an afterthought, "But before I pass from this matter, I shall adde as follows another argument or two." One of these argues for a public confession from the right of the church to pass judgment "upon the Soule touching its fitness for a State of Full Communion in the Church." The proposition seemed to him undeniable, since "every Distinct Society of men have a power essentiall to itselfe as Such Sufficient in its right exercise for its own preservation" (p. 29).

At this point he introduces a favorite rhetorical device—the carefully worded objection to be toppled like a man of straw. The objection here concedes the right of the church to judge, but asks, Why must there be an oral confession? Why not judge by the soul's behavior alone? Taylor's answer is that such a judgment would admit even pagans like Cato and Socrates, whose conduct was irreproachable, and that there must be a confession of the "Saving worke" of Christ upon the soul. Another objection asks why children of church members must make a public confession; after all, they are not in the same boat with heathens. Taylor agrees that their case is not the same, but tries to show that since the end desired—full church privileges—is the same to all, the manner of admission must be the same for all.

As if Stoddard himself were speaking, Taylor envisages here a third objection: "The End is not the Same. For to the Converted it is an Ordinance of Confirmation: but to the Unconverted, of Conversion. And therefore the manner of Admission is not the Same." But he brands this as "utterly false," "For it [the Lord's Supper] is not Ordained to Convert. For it contains in it a Contradiction *in Adjecto*; to say a

Compleate State, and yet an Unconverted State is a Contradiction" (p. 31).

BUT Taylor is not content to rest his case with this simple rebuttal. His retort extends to eighteen pages. Supposing, for the sake of discussion, that only two ordinances proper to a full and complete church state might be said to be converting—the Lord's Supper and church censures—he concentrates on the first of these.

He begins with Ramean "artificial" arguments, those "that according to the Rules of art, are gathered out of the Frame, and Artifice of the thing itselfe." There is a great preparation to be made before the Lord's Supper, "an Evangelicall Preparation as absolutly necessary not onely to the Benefits thereof but also to the Escaping the guilt of the blood of Christ." This preparation consists of (1) baptism, (2) "A Full State of Churchhood" and (3) self examination.

This last he lays out rather carefully. No wonder, when we consider that his sense of duty regarding this part of his preparation for communion yielded 217 poetical meditations over a period of forty-four years! This duty "is that, whereby he is indeed constituted an approved person; it makes him an Approved person, both in his own Conscience, and in the Sight of God" (p. 35). Approbation must be sought for both soul and body, and Taylor takes these in order. Does the Understanding possess a "Spirituell Discerning Eye" with which to perceive the saving and sanctifying light? Does the Will have the "Sanctifying Qualifications" of evangelicall repentance and saving faith? Are the "Affections, yea and the Judgment, and Conscience itselfe" likewise rightly qualified? And finally, is the body—the outward man in his actions, life and conversation—adequately prepared? "Nothing less than Saving Conversation," Taylor concludes, "is a Sufficient preparation for the Lord's Supper" (p. 37).

Again a Stoddard-like objection pops up: the injunction to examine one's self means only to try "whether we believe, in a more generall way, the Truth of the Gospell and Discern and understand that Christ, and his Death is Signified by the

Lords Supper, and that we live not in open Sins." "This is a dry, Jejune, hungry, Sapless Sense of the Text," blusters Taylor (p. 37), running the objection down rather than answering it by summing up his first artificial argument: "Seing that Ordinance, whose absolutely necessary Antecedents preparatory to it, are such as imply Conversion, is no Converting Ordinance; and Seing the Lords Supper appears to be Such an Ordinance, It is hence cleare, that the Lords Supper is no Converting Ordinance."

He goes on to the second argument: "That which bears no suitable proportion unto the Ordinances ordained for Converting Souls to God, is no Converting Ordinance" (p. 38). What must be shown is that the Lord's Supper does not have the properties required of converting ordinances; these he defines easily: (1) they are intended for and extended to the unconverted, (2) the unconverted are specifically obliged to attend them, (3) they promise to convert, (4) they are attended with clear evidence that they do convert, and (5) they enlighten minds to a sight of sin. "Now then that Ordinance that hath not these five things bears no suitable Proportion unto Converting Ordinances." And the Lord's Supper has none of these properties.

The third argument points out that, if saving grace is prerequisite to an ordinance, that ordinance cannot be said to be converting. Such is the case with the Lord's Supper, in which the closeness required between the soul and its Maker could only be achieved with saving grace. God does not require men to do that which they have no grace or power to do.

But, comes another objection, "God requires persons thô in a State of Sin to Pray, and to heare, and Obey him. Yet their prayers, hearing and obedience are Sin." Not at all, answers Taylor. "These are naturall, and not instituted worship: and the reason is not the Same touching naturall and instituted worship. Naturall worship is that duty to God flowing to God from the Essence of our Nature . . . But instituted Worship is founded upon a New Covenant account; and calls for New Covenant Qualifications" (p. 42). This is the first time Taylor rests his case squarely upon the Covenant theology, though he treats it at some length.⁶

Taylor here proceeds to a fourth argument from the nature of the sacrament itself. The supper is a seal, a visible certification of "a most intimate Communion with God." Baptism is the seal of initiation into the covenant, but the only thing remaining to be sealed then is full conversion, which must precede the seal if it is to be a confirming seal, a confirmation of the "Souls Visible growth upon the Covenant" and "Right in the Covenant Promises, and Blood of the Covenant," and of "the Acceptance, and Love of God unto the Soule" (p. 43).

A fifth argument declares the ill effects of either neglecting the sacrament or coming to it unworthily. The sixth and final argument reduces one of Stoddard's major difficulties to ridicule. If the Supper is a converting ordinance, then it should be administered to all who need it, pagans and wicked persons as well as weak Christians. But Stoddard and others were never willing to go so far. Taylor declares it absurd then, "That a Converting Ordinance is not to be administered to all that Stand in need of Conversion." If Public confession is not the only way by which a church can judge its members, he suggests, it is the best way.

ONLY a few "piddling objections" remain at this point, Taylor says, ranking one of Stoddard's chief contentions under this heading. For 1679 was a year of reckoning for New England. Increase Mather had called for a Synod to gather in Boston early in September to seek means of reforming the nation, which had experienced a great decline in church memberships and an appalling rise of sin. One reason for the lapse in zeal, Stoddard and others thought, was the embarrassment of making a public confession, a chore difficult enough to "Discourage many good Christians from Seeking Full-Communion." But what kind of reasoning is this? Taylor asks. "Because men like not Relations, Some thrô timorousness, Some thrô Pride of heart, therefore they are not the Ways of God: or if Gods Wayes, they are not to be attended on. What Divinity is this?" Furthermore, he insists that the argument sounds like a "design to draw a plea in, over the back of their goodness, for non-Converted persons admission to the Lords Table, as to a Con-

verting Ordinance, Which is a Popish Doctrine" (p. 53). Not only was Stoddard to do just this within ten years, but he was going to be accused of Popish doctrines again too.

With this Taylor surrenders his considerations of the matter of a particular church and turns his attention to the form. He treats of it in five pages, simply defining the form—or formal cause—at the outset as the "Voluntary Agreement or Covenant" which church members make with each other, "whereby they agree to walke together in the Wayes of God, in Observance of all the Ordinances of Christ, according to the Gospell" (p. 54). This is, in brief, exactly what Taylor and six others pledged to do in the formal covenant they signed immediately after the sermon. Taylor defends this practice on the basis of the nature of the church as a society, which also comes into being by a kind of social compact or agreement; by the example of the church of Israel, which formed its church on a covenant basis; by scriptural metaphors, the denial of which Taylor calls "but Rhetoricall Atheism"; and finally out of the effects flowing from the church, which only a covenant could produce.

It may have been Taylor's final admonition to his church to avoid contentions, to knit themselves one to another in love and charity, and to walk in the ways of the Lord that moved Stoddard to hold his peace. At any rate there is no record that he tried to defend himself at this time. Instead he arose and, after the new church members signed their covenant, extended his right hand to Taylor with these words: "I do in ye name of ye churches give you ye right hand of fellowship."⁷

Taylor approved of neither the form of this speech nor its brevity, yet Stoddard's restraint in the face of the public attack he had just sustained is a remarkable instance of self-control and good sense. Certainly everybody connected with the ministry must have recognized that Taylor's sermon was largely an excuse to contravert Stoddard.

WITHIN two weeks Stoddard had a chance to make his side of the argument clear. At Boston to attend the Synod

called to deplore the deadness of the times, he found himself challenged by Increase Mather to a debate. Urian Oakes, then President of Harvard, was to act as moderator. But seeing that wrangling at the Synod itself was not likely to go far to reform the times, Oakes deferred the debate until a later time.⁸ There is no evidence that Stoddard forced the issue before the September 10th meeting which Mather reported in *The Necessity of Reformation* (Boston, 1679). In May of the following year he had another opportunity when the second meeting of the Reforming Synod met to draw up a *Confession of Faith*. The only frontiersman on the committee whose task it was to draft the confession, he apparently again avoided pressing his arguments, for the proceedings "awakened no debate of consequence" and were completed within two days.⁹ He did, however, manage to word the clause on public confessions in such a way that he could later make it yield the broadest implications.¹⁰

Taylor's sermon was carefully copied and perhaps sent to Boston for publication. The realization, as Perry Miller puts it, that "there had already been more controversy over the Covenant than the society could stand, and another split over anything fundamental would wreck it,"¹¹ kept it out of print. Or it may simply be that the printer recognized it as a pretty sad piece of writing. In any case, there is no known reaction to Taylor's sermon, and he was content to preserve his friendship with Stoddard and peace and amity in the society. By the end of 1687, however, he again became alarmed over Stoddard's proselytizing and sent him the following letter dated February 13, 1687/8, which began as follows:

I presume to trouble you with a few lines upon a report that comes very hot to us, upon Some motions afoot in your Church with you. I confess I like not meddling in other mens matters: but considering as well our familiarity, as proximity, it seems a thing not altogether warrantable in me, if I should be wholly silent at this time, whether I approve or Disapprove your so weighty motions. And therefore I conclude Friendship will not permit you to be offended, if I present you with some few reasons out of many, why I dissenting from your motions entreate you . . . after I have intimated the Report which is this, Viz. that Mr. Stoddard is about to cast off Relations, and to bring all above

14 years of age, that live morally, and having Catechisticall knowledge of the Principalls of Religion, to the Lords Supper: and for that End, he hath held one day of Debate with his Church, and hath fixt upon another. Now Sir . . . I design not Disputation: nor to trouble you that way: but earnestly to entreat you touching the Same, *Sistere pedem*, whether the thing be warrantable, or not warrantable.

Eleven reasons follow, the burden of which is that the controversy raised by Stoddard is contrary to the ideal for which New England had been working for over half a century; that his idea is impractical and disturbing to the peace of the church; and that future generations "will be ready to date the beginning of New Englands Apostacy in Mr. Stoddards Motions." Taylor concludes pacifically:

These things I write in Faithfulness, and as a friend I entreat you not to be offended. But I have been too long. I will proceed no further. I entreate you put no harsh sense on anything herein. I write not to alienate, but the Contrary. If I knew anything herein that would offend, I would blott it out. . .¹²

Two things ought to be pointed out about this letter. First, it is not a "bitter letter" as it has been described.¹³ Secondly, it calls in question Miller's dating of Stoddard's actual practice of bringing all persons of decent behavior to the sacrament. Taylor refers to the news as "hot", which he is hardly likely to have done ten years after the fact. Immediately after he had copied this letter and Stoddard's answer into his commonplace book, he says that it was the winter of 1690 before Stoddard actually drew up articles for a new covenant based on his principles and presented them to his church at Northampton. And Walker indicates that the church itself did not actually adopt his theories until 1706.¹⁴

Four months later, on June 4, Stoddard answered:

I have been abundantly Satisfied these many years, that we did not attend the Will of God in this matter: and that our neglect therein is the occasion of the greate Prophaneness, and Corruption that hath overspread the Land and therefore thought it both necessary for mysele, that I might be found doing the Will of God: and necessary for the Country, that we might not go on further to forsake God. If in this matter I be under any mistake I should be glad of better Light.

Without personal animosity, he clearly implied that Taylor's light was no better than his own.

IN 1690, after learning that Stoddard had gained the support of a majority of his church, Taylor entered six more syllogisms into his commonplace book—"further thoughts about this matter besides those laid down in my Manuscript on Ephes. 2:22." What found its way into Taylor's commonplace books rarely stayed there. These and still other arguments were voiced in his sermons, a series of which, bound with "A Particular Church" in the Prince Collection,¹⁵ indicates that the work against Stoddard continued in Westfield before the Mathers were forced into print in 1700.

Some time after Christmas 1693, Taylor took up the text from Matthew 22:12, and from it drew the doctrine "That there is a Gospell Wedden Supper, that all that sit under the Faithfull Dispensation of the Gospell Ministers are called unto." This is, of course, the Lord's Supper, an interpretation of the text with which Stoddard was later to disagree, but Taylor elaborately eliminates all other interpretations and proves the strength of this one soundly. On January 21, 1693/4, he preached from the same text "That there is a Gospell Wedden Garment, Required, as absolutly necessary in all those that do approach unto the Gospell Wedden Feast." The garment is "Evangelicall Righteousness" or true sanctification.

This he followed with another sermon (the date is not clear in the manuscript), warning "That God will take a strict account of all Such as approach to the Gospell Wedden Feast without the Wedden Garment." On February 18, 1693/4, he drew the fourth and "last truth" from this text—"That no reason can be given of approaching to the Wedden Supper, without the Wedden Garment." Then he applied his doctrine in four more sermons, dated March 1, April 1, 5, and 12, 1694. The whole combination, covering 190 ample pages, equals in volume the major printed documents on both sides of the controversy.

These documents appeared in print six years later with the publication of Increase Mather's *The Order of the Gospel*, a "Defense of Evangelical Churches," written with his son, and

Stoddard's *The Doctrine of Instituted Churches*, all issued in 1700. But at this point the combattants have not really faced each other. Each argues as if unaware of the other's position, Mather defending the Half-Way covenant conceptions as Taylor would have done, and Stoddard stating his differences systematically for the first time in print. Eight years later, however, with Stoddard's sermon *The Inexcusableness of Neglecting the Worship of God under a Pretense of being in an unconverted Condition*, the polite fencing ended. Increase Mather attacked "Mr. S." in earnest in *A Dissertation, wherein The Strange Doctrine . . . is Examined and Refuted* (Boston, 1708), but the refutation was hurried, as Stoddard showed the following year in *An Appeal to the Learned . . . Against the Exceptions of Mr. Mather*.

Mather lacked either the invention or the time to do a decent job, and Stoddard shames him often with his point by point rebuttal. Mather turned to insinuations, making it appear that Stoddard was out to deform the church, not reform it, and that his arguments smacked of both treason and Papistry. Professor Miller deplores resorting to such tactics instead of "resting their case solidly upon the spiritual idealism of the Congregational vision."¹⁶ He does not point out that Stoddard returns the injury in such a way that it reflects not only upon Mather, but upon Edward Taylor too, who did rest his case on the Congregational vision. Stoddard declaims, "It seems to me that many Persons do make an idol of the Lords Supper; crying it up above all Ordinances both of the Old & New Testament, as if it were as peculiar to Saints as heavenly glory . . . It may be this is some of the relicks of Popish Idolatry, in making the Bread & Wine to be the natural Body & Blood of Christ."¹⁷ He found it easier to parry Mather than he would have to fend off Taylor. The misconceptions on the part of all three still need clarification, but Taylor's unpublished contributions to the argument prove to be the earliest, as well as the most comprehensive, rebuttal of the position called Stoddardean.

Because Taylor based his poetic meditations upon his sacrament-day sermons, he must have been preaching on the Lord's Supper again from the middle of 1711 through the end

of 1712; we have the eleven poems, but not the sermons. At this very time, however, Stoddard was enjoying another revival or harvest in Northampton, and was to have yet one more in 1718. Taylor's fight was a long and losing one. By 1726 he was quite decrepit, though in that year he attended the ordination of his successor, Nehemiah Bull. The very next year Jonathan Edwards went to help his equally aged grandfather at Northampton. By this time Taylor "had become imbecile through extreme old age,"¹⁸ and may not have been aware that in 1728 Bull had put before the church at Westfield the following question: "Whether such persons as come into full communion may not be left at their liberty as to the giving the church an account of the work of saving conversation i.e. whether relations shall not be looked upon as a matter of indifferency." A matter of indifferency! The church requested six weeks or so to think about the matter, and then "voted in the affirmative," undoing in that span of time the work of Taylor's entire ministry. "Could anything more foreign to the ideas of Hooker or of Cotton be imagined?" asks Walker.¹⁹ By 1750 only four congregations in the Connecticut valley held out against Stoddardeanism, and Taylor's was not among them.

Miller and Johnson were right, then, in ranking Edward Taylor with the Mathers and other exponents of the New England Federal theology. After the Half-Way compromise of 1662 only the sacrament of the Supper remained to distinguish the truly sanctified and visibly regenerate souls from their worldly weighted neighbors, which is why it was so precious to Taylor. His most important activity as a minister was to keep the sacrament pure, the approach to it undefiled, its rewards only for the sanctified. Miller calls this "an untenable position"; as an historical description the judgment cannot be denied. But it is fortunate for the history of American poetry that Edward Taylor could not think so.

Notes

1. Henry W. Taylor, "Edward Taylor." In William B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit* (New York 1857) I, 180.
2. Stanford attempted to demonstrate this in a long examination of Johnson's glossary. But, although he shows Johnson's wording to be shoddy, he fails to prove him wrong. He published his conclusions two years later, based on only part of their former "proof"—Taylor's "Preparatory Meditations" from June, 1711, to December, 1712. (Donald E. Stanford, "An Edition of the Complete Poetical Works of Edward Taylor," Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1953, cvii-cxi; "Edward Taylor and the Lord's Supper," *American Literature*, XXVII, May 1955, 172-178.)
3. Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Cambridge, 1953), 227, 493.
4. Edward Taylor, "A Particular Church is Gods House," in *Extracts*, Item 5 of the manuscript described on p. 159 of *The Catalogue of the Prince Library* (Boston, 1870). I do not make use of Taylor's notes on Stoddard (items 10-12) in this article. Page references in parentheses refer to this manuscript. In quoting Taylor, I retain his spelling and capitalization, but expand abbreviations and regularize punctuation.
5. In 1922 the Reverend John H. Lockwood found the thirteen folio pages of Taylor's sermon in the "Publick Records of the Church" practically illegible. He could make out enough of the sermon to see that no twentieth-century preacher either could or would write one like it. (*Westfield and Its Historic Influences*, Springfield, Mass., 1922 I, 116.)
6. The "New Covenant" is the covenant of grace promised to Adam and Eve after their fall, and plighted with Abraham.
7. Stanford, *op. cit.*, lv; Lockwood, *op. cit.*, I, 116-117; B. B. Edwards, "Complete List of the Congregational Ministers in the Old Country of Hampshire," *American Quarterly Register*, X (1838), 401.
8. Perry Miller, "Solomon Stoddard," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXXIV (October, 1941, 299.)
9. Williston Walker, *A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States* (New York, 1894), 189-190.
10. Perry Miller, *From Colony to Province*, 232.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Both this letter and Stoddard's answer are in Taylor's common-place book in the possession of the Massachusetts Historical Society.
13. Nor is it the kind of involved rationalization Taylor had thrust into Stoddard's face eight years before.
14. Walker, *History*, 180.
15. *The Catalogue of the Prince Library*, 159, item 8.
16. Perry Miller, "Solomon Stoddard," 313.
17. Solomon Stoddard, *An Appeal to the Learned* (Boston, 1709), 53.
18. Henry W. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 178.
19. Cited in "A Historical Sketch of Stoddardeanism, with some account of its effect upon the churches in Old Hampshire County, Mass.," *The New Englander*, IV (July, 1846), 354; Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism* (New York, 1893), 282, n. 3 & 4; Lockwood, *op. cit.*, I, 333.

Pilgrimages to Palestine

By EDITH A. WRIGHT

“**T**O journey safely to the Holy Land and return home alive and well must be regarded as an act of God,”¹ wrote Friar Felix Fabri, a Dominican preacher of Ulm. One cannot accuse him of exaggeration, for there were very real perils and hardships to be met with—pirates, the Turks, storms, hostile Arabs, great heat, fatigue, insufficient and tainted food and water—so that many became sick and died along the way. And yet throughout the fifteenth century a constant stream of pilgrims made the voyage, some of them two or three times, like Fabri himself. For the Rieters of Nuremberg the journey to Jerusalem was a family tradition, begun in 1384 by Hans Rieter, maintained in the fifteenth century by five others, including a grandfather, father, and son, down to Joachim, who travelled there in 1608, the eighth of his line to do so.²

The motives behind the expedition were mixed, though the obvious one of religious piety was certainly uppermost. Many of the written accounts mirror this feeling, though some of the lay pilgrims seem chiefly impressed by the indulgences to be gained. Preachers like Fabri believed that they could understand and expound the Bible better if they had seen the places mentioned in it. Some pilgrims had bound themselves by a vow; for others, the journey was required as a penance. Sometimes they sent substitutes; thus in 1433 Count Henry of Montfort made a pilgrimage in the name of Duke Henry of Bavaria.³ Two German nobles went to pray for the birth of a son, and many young men wished to be dubbed knights at the Holy Sepulcher. For the French knights Ghillebert de Lannoy and Bertrandon de la Broquière the pilgrimage served to cloak a military reconnaissance. More frivolous considerations also entered in. The Italian cavalier Santo Brasco chides those who go just to see the world, or to be able to boast “I have been there,” “I have seen that.”⁴ But the simple love of travel and adventure was no doubt a moving force in

many cases. Felix Fabri, with characteristic honesty, writes:

The thing which makes the desert journey bearable is that every day, or rather almost every hour, one enters new regions, where both air and earth show a different aspect, and where the mountains are of varied shapes and colors. Something new is always happening and even the immensity and barrenness of the desert please the curious traveller. For myself, the solitude of the desert delights me more than the fertility and beauty of the Egyptian oases.”⁵

It is a bit startling to find in this fifteenth-century friar a precursor of the Romantics.

The pilgrims themselves are as various as the motives which inspired them—great prelates and obscure monks, noblemen and plain citizens, young and old, rich and poor, sophisticated and simple. Even women made the trip in spite of the hardships involved, and although Pope Gregory XII, in the fourteenth century, had strictly forbidden them to go.⁶ Fabri records that there were six rich elderly widows on his first trip in 1480. Their presence was resented by the other pilgrims, but they were quiet and patient and stood the journey well; in fact, on the return trip they even helped nurse their less hardy companions. On his second trip there was just one woman, travelling with her husband. She antagonized everyone by her curiosity and loquaciousness, so that there was general rejoicing when she accidentally got left behind on an island.⁷

The most famous woman pilgrim was Margery Kempe, who made the journey in 1413.⁸ Leaving her husband in Lynn, she started out with a party, but her overpious table-conversation annoyed the others so much that they deserted her at Constance. She continued with an elderly man as her guide. People fed them along the way, and some good women even gave up their beds to her. At Bologna the party agreed to let her rejoin them, if she would promise not to speak of the Gospel but “to be still at table and make merry.” On arriving at Jerusalem, her emotion was so overwhelming that she almost fell off her donkey. The Saracens were apparently impressed by her weeping spells, and “all people were good and gentle to her except her own countrymen.”

Like modern travellers, many of the returned pilgrims wrote books about their experiences. The earliest narrative extant belongs to the fourth century, and for each succeeding century at least one account has been preserved.⁹ They became numerous in the twelfth century; and Titus Tobler's *Bibliographia geographica Palestinae* (Geneva, 1877) lists no less than eighty for the fifteenth century. Many of these repeat the same itineraries, giving distances between cities along the way, pointing out the holy places to be visited, and furnishing information on exchange, expenses, and necessary provisions. Some of this material is thought to derive from the "Old Compendium," known in the thirteenth century but since lost. A few books include glossaries of foreign words. Thus Arnold von Harff, a knight of Cologne, provides short vocabularies in Slavonic, Albanian, Greek, Arabic, Hebrew, Turkish, Hungarian, and Breton, with such phrases as "How much does it cost?" and "Will you wash my shirt?"¹⁰ One of these, an impudent proposal to a woman, apparently landed him in jail.

Guides of this type were available to pilgrims in Venice; Friar Felix, for instance, mentions picking up a "Processional for Travellers" there. At the other extreme are the detailed records of a particular expedition, such as those of the Franciscan Paul Walther of Guglingen (1480-83) and of Pietro Casola, canon of the Cathedral of Milan (1494). In between fall such narratives as those of Bertrandon de la Broquière, of the Etonian Fellow, William Wey, and of the famous Bernhard von Breydenbach. Von Harff's book, starting as a practical guide, wanders off into fantastic narrative, in the manner of Mandeville, whom indeed he copied.

ARTICLES in *More Books* and this *Quarterly* have already discussed the works of Mandeville, Breydenbach, and the thirteenth-century friar Burchard of Mount Zion, whose description of the Holy Land was frequently drawn upon by later writers.¹¹ The Boston Public Library owns fifteenth-century editions of all three. In addition, it has recently acquired a splendid copy of Hans Tucher's *Reise in das Gelobte Land*, published by Heinrich Knoblochtzer at Strassburg in

1484. The first edition was printed at Augsburg by Johann Schönsperger in 1482, and two others followed in the same year. There were two in 1483, 1484, and 1486, and one in 1488. As may be seen, Tucher's book was one of the most popular guides of its time.

Planned for practical use, the volume was without doubt often carried along on pilgrimages, as were Baedekers by modern travellers. Consequently, few copies of any of the editions have been preserved. Miss Stillwell locates only seven in her *Incunabula in American Libraries* (1940). Of the edition owned by the Boston Public Library, only one other copy is listed, which is in the Pierpont Morgan Library.

The Library's copy is bound in wooden boards, half-covered with leather, and with a plain metal clasp. The leather is roughly cut along the edges. The book is printed in a single Gothic type, the divisions of the text being indicated by paragraph-marks and occasional one-line spaces. The only adornment is a large capital "N" in a simple design of branches and leaves, which occurs twice. The frontispiece, however, is a handsome full-page portrait, presumably that of the author. With one hand raised, as if to emphasize his words, he is arrayed in a tunic which reveals an embroidered undergarment with long sleeves. Pointed sandals and a high brimless hat complete the costume. The background consists of a large decorative pattern. Manuscript notes in German are scattered through the book. On the fly-leaf is the name of a former owner, Johannes Kolbius, with the date 1608.

The title-page has a four-line title: *Ein underrichtung von einem burger Hanns tucher von Nuremberg wie man sich halten sol zu dem heyligen grab uber mer faren und die heiligen stet aldo suchen wil.* ("An instruction by a burgher, Hans Tucher of Nuremberg, how one should proceed if one wishes to travel across the sea to the Holy Sepulcher and visit the Holy City there.") The text begins: "1475 years after the birth of Christ, our dear Lord, on Tuesday, the sixth day of the month of May, I, Hans Tucher, being fifty-one years of age, visited the holy places in the name of Almighty God, willing only the honor of God and the salvation of my soul, and not impelled by desire for fame or by any frivolous motives."



Frontispiece of "Ein Unterrichtung" by Hans Tucher (Strassburg, 1484)

The author relates briefly his trip from Germany to Jerusalem and Mount Sinai and, somewhat more at length, his Egyptian experiences. His companion, Sebald Rieter, also wrote an account, large portions of which are almost identical with Tucher's. Rieter's work, however, was published only in 1884, along with the narratives of other pilgrimages made by his family. At Venice the two took on a German boy who knew the "heathen language." In the Holy Land, they travelled with the chancellor of the Duke of Saxony and his servant.

Tucher's style is dry and matter-of-fact, and his religion did not inspire him to the effusions found in some of the other writers. He systematically collected indulgences, making a second trip to the valley of Jehoshaphat and the Mount of Olives for that purpose. Since the cloister of St. Saba had no indulgences attached, pilgrims did not visit it, but the house of Dives, the rich man of the Bible, though in the same category, was shown them as a curiosity. No indulgences were granted at Absalom's grave, or at the place where Judas hanged himself, or where David killed Goliath. The Temple of Solomon was closed to Christians, but they could obtain full indulgences there as if they had entered.

In Alexandria Tucher had a bad adventure. While strolling along the shore, he and the chancellor approached too close to the fortifications and were taken for spies. He was cut on the neck with a bread-knife, and both of them were thrown into prison. Luckily, through the intervention of the Venetian consul, they were soon freed.

The list of necessary provisions given by Tucher must have been useful to the prospective traveller, and is of interest to a modern reader.¹² "First of all," he begins, "let each man provide himself with enough money, for he will have many unexpected expenses. One rarely hears of anyone who has taken too much, whereas one always meets ten or twenty people who have taken too little." Most of the equipment could be obtained in Venice. One should have a coat made there of black or grey cloth, not too good or too poor. A man also needs a black doublet and two pairs of breeches, one of thin cloth. "Lederhosen" are not satisfactory. A

tight-fitting coat of yellow washable leather is good to sleep in on the ship, and for use on cold nights in the Holy Land, while a felt cloak with a hood and a white lining will offer protection against rain and cold, and may be spread over an ass's back to sit on. Other essentials are at least four good shirts, four night-caps and four handkerchiefs, also four good pairs of shoes, with knee-high leather boots for riding and walking. One must take a pair of wooden stirrups (iron ones would be stolen by the Arabs) and saddlebags.

The pilgrims had to bring their pots and pans, as well as their bedding. Tucher recommends a straw mattress, a feather bolster, cushions, two pairs of sheets, and six ells of heavy black cloth for curtains. Two cakes of soap, towels, and a basin to wash one's feet in are indispensable, while paper, pens, and ink will help to pass the time in recording what one sees.

Food and drink were provided on the galley, but not in port or in the Holy Land. Tucher says that wine is "one's life" on the ship, and suggests taking two casks of it, as well as two new casks for water. The list of foods includes ten or fifteen pounds of butter per person, freshly salted in a new pail, a half ducat's worth of good fresh cheese, raisins, almonds, olive oil and vinegar, salted ham and tongue, a large sausage, dried fish (flounder was best), and the best biscuits one can obtain. Eight or ten live hens can be carried in a basket. Two pounds of sugar are desirable, and one of sugar-candy, which helps to relieve thirst. A large chest will hold all these things and can also serve as a bed. One could buy extra provisions for the desert journey at Gaza, such as chickens, one hundred eggs, salt, bread, rice, apples, and two hundred lemons. A bow and arrow should be obtained there, but secretly, as the Arabs do not like to see the Christians armed.

Tucher also lists the needed medicines and gives various health-hints. For example, two or three morsels of bread moistened in wine and taken before each meal aid digestion. It is dangerous to stay on deck too late in the evening, or to go out before the sun is well up in the sky. Various remedies for sea-sickness are mentioned; in general, sour things are helpful. For thirst, he recommends cool water (if it is available) mixed with a little vinegar or wine.

For the actual trip, the author gives little more than an outline, but other writers help to fill in the picture. In this respect Friar Fabri's account is particularly instructive, as he wrote down his experiences every day "in storms at sea, riding on an ass or camel in the desert, or at night when everyone else was asleep." Since he was intelligent and interested in everything, his narrative is fascinating to read, provided one does a little judicious skipping.

TRAVEL to the Holy Land at this time was a highly organized and lucrative business. Most pilgrims sailed from Venice on galleys owned by the state and leased to "patrons" or captains, who were usually members of the patrician families. Two galleys regularly set out for Jaffa in the spring and, at least in the first part of the fifteenth century, there was also galley-service in the fall. There were also sailing boats, which were cheaper but slower. Arnold von Harff of Cologne and the Franciscan Paul Walther travelled on a merchant's galley, although this was forbidden by Venetian law.¹³ Tucher's ship carried sixty-five passengers; he writes that seventy is the limit for safety and comfort. The trip might take from six to eight weeks, but William Wey did it in four weeks and four days. Stops were made at various ports for water and provisions, and contrary winds often cause delays.

Each passenger signed a contract with the captain, who promised to take him to Jaffa, provide two hot meals a day while at sea, and accompany the party personally to Jerusalem and back paying all expenses.¹⁴ Special arrangements could be made to take the excursion to Mount Sinai and the monastery of Saint Catherine. Prices varied according to the bargains struck and the prosperity of the passenger. A decree of 1441 forbade the captain to charge more than fifty ducats for the journey (exclusive of Mount Sinai.)¹⁵ William Wey said in 1481 that one must pay forty ducats "for to be in a goud honeste plase, and to have yowre ese in the galey and also to be cheryschet." The popular English guide, *Information for Pilgrims unto the Holy Land*, first printed by Wykyn de Worde

in 1498, copied his words but raised the figure to fifty ducats.¹⁶ Tucher and Rieter agreed to pay forty; Casola had bargained for forty-five, but later increased the amount to sixty to obtain a seat at the captain's table. Poor pilgrims paid less and provided their own meals.¹⁷ Sailing vessels and merchant galleys carried friars, such as Paul Walther and his companion, without charge.¹⁸

As for the meals, Tucher advises the pilgrim to take food and drink of his own for often there is not enough and what there is may be unappetizing. Other writers make similar comments. The *Information for Pilgrims* warns 'sometyme ye shall have feble brede and feble wyne and stynkyng water, soo that many tymes ye woll be ryght fayne to ete of your owne." Even Casola, at the captain's table, got nothing on his return trip but beans and vinegar for days.

Friar Felix records that malmsey wine, "well-baptized with water," was served at the beginning of every meal. The cooking was abominable. Food was prepared in the Italian style, and consisted of lettuce with oil, if any were obtainable, meat, a dish made from some kind of grain, and cheese. On fast-days small fish or eggs were served. The first days there was fresh bread; later, biscuits as hard as rocks.

He portrays the daily life on the galley. The hours, he writes, are long and tedious for those who do not know how to employ them. The Saxons and Flemings spend their time drinking; many gamble at dice, cards or chess, or sing and play on various instruments. Some argue about worldly matters; others read or pray, sit and think, or spend their time sleeping. The young and high-spirited laugh and shout. Still others, like the Friar himself, watch the sea and the land, and write down what they see. All have one unavoidable chore—the extermination of lice and fleas—for unless a man devotes a few hours each day to this, he will not be able to sleep at night.

Each pilgrim was allotted a place for sleeping, which was marked with chalk on the floor. According to a decree of 1497, this must be one and a half feet wide, and long enough so one could stretch out at full length.¹⁹ Nights were seldom peaceful. To quote Friar Felix again, there were arguments

about the sleeping-places, sometimes resulting in fist-fights and drawn swords. Thoughtless passengers kept their lamps burning and annoyed others, and some, after the lights were out, tried to settle the affairs of the world with their neighbors, talking until the middle of the night. Snore, the groans of the sick, and the trampling of animals overhead all conspired to render sleep difficult, while the hard beds, cramped quarters, heat, odors, insects, rats, and mice added to the discomfort.

AT Jaffa the pilgrims had to wait several days either on the galley or in a filthy cave on shore until guides with donkeys came from Jerusalem, together with the prior of the Franciscan monastery of Mount Zion. On landing, everyone had to pass inspection by the Saracens. His name and age, height and distinguishing marks, such as wounds, were recorded.²⁰

Relations between the pilgrims and the natives were not exactly cordial. All writers speak of having stones thrown at them, having their hats snatched from their heads, being pulled from their donkeys, or worse, Tucher reports that a bare-foot monk in his party was hit with a stick. Pilgrims were warned not to retaliate. Extortion of all kinds was rife; frequently pilgrims were thrown into prison and had to buy their way out. Both Sebald Rieter and Arnold von Harff were put into neck-irons; the manuscripts of the latter's book have an amusing picture of him in this plight.

It is perhaps not surprising that the Christian writers refer to the Arabs as "dogs." Yet one also hears of kindly individuals. Felix Fabri admits that his mule-driver was faithful, and says that "Calinus minor" who guided his party to Mount Sinai, was a "mild and patient man," who would have given his life for the pilgrims in his charge. Fabri was "ashamed" that some of the pilgrims wept when they parted company, but Calinus had been like a father to them.²¹ And Bertrandon, deserted by his companions when he fell sick, was nursed by his Arab guide. Staying in an Arab encampment, he was never molested, although he had considerable money and two camels loaded with provisions and wine.

In Jerusalem, most pilgrims were lodged at the hospice of St. John, but Tucher and his friend Rieter stayed in the house of the "lesser Calinus." Built in the middle of the twelfth century, the hospice could hold over two thousand people.²² Brother Walther, who went the year after Tucher, complains that the pilgrims were wretchedly lodged, with only the bare pavement to sleep on.

The usual stay in Jerusalem was about two weeks, but on Fabri's first trip his group was allowed only nine days, and was so rushed about from place to place that many fell ill and several died. The program of sight-seeing was always exhausting, including as it did most of the places mentioned in the New Testament. Even the spot where water was heated to wash the apostles' feet was pointed out.

Three visits to the Holy Sepulcher were permitted, and it was customary to lock the pilgrims in over night. Priests were allowed to say Mass, and there was great rivalry to get the best places. As for the laymen, the devout spent their time praying at the sacred monuments. But pilgrims did not automatically become holy, any more than modern travellers automatically become cultured. Certain of the knights, whom Friar Felix characterizes as "irreligious, hard-hearted, and undisciplined," became restive by the third visit, and "stolid and arid pilgrims, no better than beasts," even made fun of their more pious companions, calling them "hypocrites" and "show-offs." Some of them made perfunctory visits to the altars, and then, after eating and drinking, looked about for a quiet place to sleep. Others had brought a supply of good strong wine, which they proceeded to consume. When it was gone, they indulged in idle talk about rulers, battle-experiences, law-suits, and wages, all mingled with lies and boasts. Another group passed the night bargaining with merchants, who offered for sale rosaries, precious stones, silken cloths, and souvenirs. These native Christian salesmen, "sly and avaricious heretics," had surrounded the pilgrims from Jaffa onwards. Of the German nobles, many wrote their names on the walls or carved them on columns and marble tablets, while souvenir-hunters pried off pieces of the monuments.

From Jerusalem, most of the pilgrims returned to Jaffa, but some made the trip through the desert to Mount Sinai and thence to Cairo. The journey was often disastrous. Tucher was one of the fortunate few who survived, and the *Nuremberg Chronicle* mentions the reception which greeted him on his return.

The fifteenth century was the last great century for pilgrimages to the Holy Land. Many causes contributed to their decline—the discovery of the western world, worsening conditions in the Near East, and the Reformation were all factors. Towards the end of the sixteenth century the annual service of galleys was abandoned.²³

This article, which has stressed the secular, rather than the religious, aspects of the pilgrimages, gives only an inadequate idea of the rich store of information about late medieval life and travel contained in the pilgrim narratives. The best of them also bring vividly to life individual travellers, who seem almost like contemporaries.

Notes

1. Felix Fabri, *Evagatorium in Terrae Sanctae, Arabiae et Egypti Peregrinationem*, ed. C. D. Hassler (Stuttgart, 1843-49, 3 vols), I, 60. The parts relating to the Holy Land have been translated into English by A. Stewart (Palestine Pilgrim's Text Society, 1892-93. 2 vols). H. F. M. Prescott has made a book out of Fabri's experiences, with the title *Friar Felix at Large* (New Haven, 1950).

2. See *Das Reisebuch der Familie Rieter*, ed. Reinhold Röhrriicht and Heinrich Meisner (Tübingen, 1884).

3. Reinhold Röhrriicht, *Deutsche Pilgerreise nach dem heiligen Lande* (Innsbruck, 1900), 108.

4. M. M. Newett, *Canon Pietro Casola's Pilgrimage to Jerusalem* (Manchester, 1907), 10.

5. Fabri, *Evagatorium*, II, 424.

6. Röhrriicht, *op. cit.*, 6.

7. Newett, *op. cit.*, 161, n. 1.

8. Margery Kempe, *The Book of Margery Kempe*, ed. S. B. Meech (London, Early English Text Society, 1940).

9. Thomas Wright, *Early Travels in Palestine* (London, 1848), ix.

10. Arnold von Harff, *The Pilgrimage of Arnold von Harff*, translated and edited by Malcolm Letts (London, Hakluyt Society, 1946).

11. Zoltán Haraszti, "Breydenbach: Peregrinationes in Terram Sanctam,"

More Books, May 1937, 195-201, and "The Travels of Sir John Mandeville," *Boston Public Library Quarterly*, October 1950, 306-316; Edith A. Wright, "La Mer des Hystoires," *ibid.*, April 1959, 69-74.

12. Tucher actually gives two lists, the second of which was copied from an expense-account of "Duke Wilhelm." (Röhricht, *op. cit.*, 5).

13. Newett, *op. cit.*, 45. Brother Paul Walther's account has been edited by M. Sollweck, *Itinerarium in Terram Sanctam et ad Sanctam Catharinam* (Tübingen, 1892).

14. Copies of contracts are given by Breydenbach, Casola, Tucher, and William Wey. For the last, see *The Itineraries of William Wey* (London, 1857). Contracts for the Mount Sinai trip can be found in Breydenbach, Fabri, von Harff, and Tucher.

16. *Information for Pilgrims unto the Holy Land*, ed. E. G. Duff (London, 1893).

17. Newett, *op. cit.*, 12.

18. *Ibid.*, 95. Wealthy persons also gained merit by aiding pilgrims; thus, Breydenbach helped both Fabri and Walther. Sometimes guilds paid the expenses. (J. A. A. Jusserand, *English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages*, 4th ed., New York, 1950, 222).

19. Newett, *op. cit.*, 101.

20. In addition to the accounts already cited, see Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Le Voyage d'Outremer*, ed. Ch. Scherer (Paris, 1892); and H. Morganvillé, *Un Pèlerinage en Terre Sainte et au Sinaï au Xve siècle* (Paris, 1905).

21. The two official Saracen dragomans were known to the pilgrims as the "greater and lesser Calinus." According to Röhricht (*op. cit.*, 60), the word is a corrupt form of the Arabic "Kulaguz," meaning "guide."

22. Sollweck, *op. cit.*, 115, n. 1.

23. Newett, *op. cit.*, 112.

Lydia Maria Child and the Indians

By LLOYD C. TAYLOR, JR.

ONE summer Sunday in 1824 Lydia Maria Francis wandered into the study of her brother Convers, minister of the First Church at Watertown, Massachusetts. There she came across a copy of the *North American Review* for April, 1831. Thumbing through the magazine, she noticed an article about "Yamoyden," a now forgotten poem. Although the poem lacked "connective texture," the reviewer — his name unsigned, but now identified with Dr. J. B. Palfrey — was pleased. He praised the descriptive passages, and went on:

We are glad that somebody has at last found out the unequalled fitness of our early history for the purposes of a work of fiction. For ourselves, we know not the country or age which has such capacities in this view as N. England in its early day . . . We had the same puritan character of stern, romantic enthusiasm of which, in the Scottish novels, such effective use is made, but impressed here on the whole face of society, and sublimed to a degree which it never elsewhere reached.¹

The words fired the imagination of the girl of twenty-two. Since childhood she had revered the institutions of New England; and the reference to the Scottish novels stimulated her thinking. After finishing *Waverly* she had once exclaimed: "Why cannot I write a novel?"² She had probably never forgotten her youthful outburst; and the review renewed her zest. Taking pen and paper, she started to write; before the hour for the afternoon service she completed the first chapter of a novel. Once begun, the work took form rapidly, and within a year it was finished. Cummings, Hilliard and Company published it as *Hobomok, A Tale of Early Times* "by an American."

As a literary work *Hobomok* leaves much to be desired. However, as one of the first discussions of discrimination against the Indian, the novel takes on new significance. It tells the story of Mary Conant, the daughter of an early settler of Salem, who falls in love with Charles Brown, an Anglican, forced into exile for his proselytizing. Later she hears that he has drowned, and in desperation turns to *Hobomok*, a young

Indian, who had always loved her. Much against her father's will she elopes with him, and in time becomes the mother of a fine son. Meanwhile, Brown returns to Salem in search of Mary. Hobomok realizes that his wife still loves her former fiancé, and after long inner struggle goes off into the forest, leaving her and his son to Brown.

The most important sections of the novel are occupied with the marriage of Mary to Hobomok, a theme which was startling especially in that early period. The *North American Review* commented irately: "There can be, we believe, but one opinion respecting this story; it is in very bad taste, to say the least, and leaves upon the mind a disagreeable impression."³

Maria produced strong characterizations of both Conant and Hobomok. She portrayed Conant as an inflexible Calvinist, whose "earliest enemies had been of the English church, and . . . [who] had seen his wife drooping and dying amid the poverty which his religious opinions had brought upon her, and yet he tried hard to be convinced, and did at last verily believe, that earthly motives had nothing to do with his hatred of Episcopacy."⁴ Left alone, after his wife's death and his daughter's marriage, he finds consolation in spite of his "stern, unbending sense of duty, a gloomy experience of human nothingness."⁵ In contrast to his bigotry, Hobomok appears as the Noble Savage in the best Romantic tradition. And yet his nobility dominates the novel. The author must have had some purpose other than merely telling a tale of star-crossed love.

Having selected Salem as her setting, Maria naturally had to consider the question of religion. Her opposition to organized religion stands out. Mrs. Conant as her spokesman tells:

I have lately thought that a humble heart was more than a strong mind, in perceiving the things appertaining to divine truth. Matters of dispute appear more and more like a vapor which passeth away. I have seldom joined in them; for it appears to me there is little good in being convinced, if we are not humbled; to know every thing about religion, and yet to feel little of its power — yea, even to feel burdened with a sense of sin and misery, and yet be content to remain in it.⁶

Although she found no fault with religion in itself, nor doubted the existence of God, Maria did object to the emphasis placed

on dogma. She thought that the church cared little for human feelings, so busy was it in waging ritualistic battles. The idea is carried out by balancing the dogmatism of Conant against the magnanimity of Hobomok. Therefore, when she described Hobomok as being "cast in nature's noblest mould," she referred not to him alone, but to man in a free state, above the hide-bound restraints placed upon the individual by society. Conant could not accept his daughter's marriage, because his scruples, imposed not by God nor by nature but by man, would not permit him to do so. On the other hand, Hobomok, "whose nature was unwarped by the artifices of civilized life," could renounce his personal welfare for the happiness of his fellow-man.⁷ The author looked upon this love of humanity as the sign of an inward and spiritual grace. Thus she felt it was primitive man, living close to nature, who truly abided by the dictates of God.

AFTER the publication of *Hobomok* Maria turned toward new directions; but her marriage to David Lee Child on October 19, 1828, rekindled her fervor for the plight of the Indian.

Prior to their marriage Child had been elected to the Massachusetts legislature on the Whig ticket. Through him Maria came into contact with the staunch supporters of John Quincy Adams. When she arrived in Boston the great issue was the question of the Cherokee Indians. After ceding their hunting grounds to Georgia in the late eighteenth century, the Cherokees struck out across the mountains and settled in the northwest corner of the state. All went well until 1828-29 when gold was discovered in the district. The "crackers" moved in and soon demanded the land. President Adams sent federal troops to protect the Indians, but when Andrew Jackson assumed office he gave Georgia *carte blanche* to move against them.

David Child and his Whig friends viewed Jackson's action as a crime. They looked upon him as a monster, rallying "all lovers of liberty" to their cause. No one responded more rapidly than Maria. In 1829 she wrote *The First Settlers of New England; or, Conquest of the Pequods, Narragansets, and Pokanekets. As Related by a Mother to her Children.*

As the subtitle indicates, the book is in the form of a dialogue between a mother and her two daughters, Caroline and Elizabeth. There was no attempt at characterization. The author merely used the history of the Pequods and Narragansets to show the difficulties which the Indians had endured, presenting her case in broad terms:

I ardently hope that this unvarnished tale, which I have offered to view, will impress our youth with the conviction of their obligation to alleviate, as much as is in their power, the sufferings of the generous and interesting race of men whom we have so unjustly supplanted.⁸

Drawing heavily upon the histories of Winthrop, Hubbard, and Hutchinson, she fashioned every Indian chief in the mold of Hobomok. But she never became so enamored of her noble savages that she failed to discuss the reason for the discrimination against them.

In *Hobomok* she implied that religious bigotry lay at the root of racial tension. In *The First Settlers of New England* she further developed the theme. The bigotry, she believed, stemmed from the Judaic influence on Christianity. The Jews "were a stiff-necked, rebellious, contentious people, almost perpetually engaged in intestine or foreign wars."⁹ The great task which confronted churchmen was to

... wholly cleanse Christianity from the impure influences of Judaism, and thus remove all incentives which nourish passions opposed to that religion, which is "pure and peaceable, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy."¹⁰

Having traced the Hebraic tradition in the various Christian denominations, she concluded that it was most deeply ingrained in Calvinism; and since the Calvinists regarded themselves as God's elect, they were convinced that He guided their every action. In this manner they justified their racial discrimination.

AFTER *The First Settlers of New England* Mrs. Child for a time forsook the crusade for Indian rights, to join the ranks of the abolitionists. However, after the Negro had gained his freedom she returned to the cause of the red man, which once more came to the front. Many tribes inhabited lands desired

by railroads or war veterans, and the attempts to remove them led to massacres.

The government, recognizing the necessity of action, in 1865 appointed a Congressional Committee on the Condition of Indian Tribes. Its findings resulted in the formation of an Indian Peace Commission, which had the task not only of putting an end to the Indian wars but also of formulating a permanent Indian policy. The report of the Peace Commission stirred Mrs. Child to the writing of *An Appeal for the Indians*. Although the report on the whole pleased her, she found it lacking on several points. Referring to the use of force to settle all issues, she wrote:

We have so long indulged in feelings of pride and contempt toward those whom we are pleased to call "the subject races" that we have actually become incapable of judging of them with any tolerable degree of candor or common sense. How *ought* we to view the peoples who are less advanced than ourselves? Simply as younger members of the same great human family, who need to be protected, instructed, and encouraged, till they are capable of appreciating and sharing all our advantages.¹²

But, despite the ill effects of coercion, all differences could not be attributed to force alone. Religion had a share of the blame:

The great, the almost insurmountable difficulty in the way of universal civilization has always been that Christian nations in their transactions with people of other religions, have never considered themselves bound by the same moral principles which regulate their conduct toward those of similar faith and equal power.¹³

The Peace Commission recommended that the Indians be placed on a reservation and governed by a man of "unquestioned integrity and purity of character . . . with a salary sufficient to place him above temptation."¹⁴ Mrs. Child agreed with the suggestion, but feared it would prove impractical. Since the white Christian had no scruples in his relations with the Indian, she doubted that any salary "would place a white governor of Indians above temptation."¹⁵

She also disliked the feeling of white superiority in the attitude toward schools for the Indian children. The report stipulated that all instruction must be in English; she, on the other hand, recommended:

I would say let their books, at first, be printed in Indian with English translations; and let them contain selections from the best of their own traditionary stories, and records of such things as have been truly honorable in the history of their "braves" . . . Let proficiency in English and the habit of speaking it, be rewarded with some peculiar privileges and honors.¹⁶

The Commission advised that polygamy be severely punished; she thought the idea was ridiculous. Instead of harsh measures, which could only antagonize the Indian, she proposed that polygamy "should be discountenanced and reasoned against and privileges conferred on those who live with one wife."¹⁷

The report alone was insufficient, for mere words could not aid the Indian, who required expert assistance. Mrs. Child found one group particularly qualified for such a work — the Quakers. She urged them on, for they "better than any others, can 'reach the witness' in untutored minds, because they let alone the incomprehensible doctrine of theology, and inculcate those great principles of morality, easily understood and recognized by all men."¹⁸

Lydia Maria Child waged her battle for the Indians calmly, displaying a restraint rare in nineteenth-century reformers. She is remembered chiefly as an abolitionist; but it is a major oversight to neglect her work for the Indian.

Notes

1. *North American Review*, April 1821, 480.
2. John Greenleaf Whittier, "Introduction," *Letters of Lydia Maria Child* (Boston, 1882), vi.
3. *North American Review*, July 1825, 87.
4. Lydia Maria Child, *Hobomok* (Boston, 1824), 148.
5. *Ibid.*, 165. 6. *Ibid.*, 94-95. 7. *Ibid.*, 151.
8. Lydia M. Child, *The First Settlers of New England* (Boston, 1829), iv.
9. *Ibid.*, 102. 10. *Ibid.*, 108. 11. *Ibid.*, 110.
12. Lydia Maria Child, *An Appeal for the Indians* (New York, 1868), 8.
13. *Ibid.*, 16. 14. *Ibid.*, 7. 15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*, 7-8. 17. *Ibid.* 18. *Ibid.*

Modern Wood-Engraving in America

By ARTHUR W. HEINTZELMAN

BEFORE the turn of the century when wood-engraving in America called for a faithful transcript of another artist's work, usually for reproductive purposes, the method had to express the manner and intent of the original in texture, tone, and technique. This called for a group of engravers whose expertness was the result of long apprenticeship dictated by the founders of the New School of Engraving, namely, John G. Smithwick and Timothy Cole. These engravers had nothing but engraving technique to think about, for the difficulties of relative values and drawing were in the original composition from which their copy was made.

With the abandonment of wood-engraving as a means of reproduction, a number of artists realized that wood-engraving had great possibilities as a creative medium and that it could be developed to take its place with the other great graphic arts: etching, copper-engraving, and lithography.

Among the artists whose works were chosen from the Print Department collections for exhibition during the months of November and December 1959 were Gustav Wolf, Thomas W. Nason, Clare Leighton, Grace Albee, Asa Cheffetz, Rockwell Kent, Lynd Ward, Fritz Eichenberg, Misch Kohn, Paul Landacre, Nora Unwin, and Herbert Waters.

Gustav Wolf was born in 1887 at Ostringen, near Heidelberg. Brought up in cultural surroundings, he developed an early talent for drawing. He studied with Hans Thoma at the Academy of Arts in Karlsruhe, where he was later appointed a professor. On the centenary of the Prussian State Museums, he was commissioned to design a portfolio depicting the installation of art antiquities from Greece and Asia Minor in the Berlin State Museum.

Early in 1938, Mr. Wolf came to the United States, where he began his struggle for recognition. He had considerable

success in New York with architectural subjects in which he combined mysticism and allegory, emphasizing the insignificance of humanity in relation to the tremendous mass of steel and stone. Four years later he moved to Cummington, Massachusetts, where he executed wood-engravings to illustrate his *Book of Job*, published in 1944. In the following year he accepted a teaching position at the Northfield School for Girls, remaining there until his death in 1947.

Wolf's early work includes such forceful achievements as "Confessio," 1908; "The Seven Days of Creation," 1913; illustrations to Goethe's *Märchen*, 1922; *Die Reise nach Tetuan*, 1925; and *The Psalms*—the last named being chosen for this exhibition. These compositions reveal that his methods and ideas were ahead of his time. He absorbed all the tendencies of his contemporaries and formed them into his own creative talent. The mental concepts were removed from the naturalistic world and developed into pure unrelated ornament, with a content as universal as any of the great arts.

Thomas W. Nason (born in Dracut, Massachusetts, in 1899) wrote in describing his engraving "Morning," published by the Woodcut Society:

In the early 'twenties I became aware of an increasing interest in wood engravings, based mainly on seeing them used as book decorations and magazine illustrations. These prints, done, for the most part, in a bold and effective manner with rich blacks and sparkling whites, appealed to me very strongly. I seemed to see great possibilities in the medium for personal art expression. In 1922 I made my first wood engraving, which was more of a laboratory experiment than anything else. The decision was soon reached that I would never find it particularly thrilling to cut away the wood around the lines on the block simply to reproduce my drawing. But I was exceedingly interested in engraving extemporaneously directly on the block with a smooth-cutting engraver's tool which would go in any direction with equal freedom. I found this kind of engraving on wood a creative process within itself. As I became familiar with the use of the burin on boxwood and perfected my knowledge of printing from engraved blocks, the fascination of the process really got hold of me.

Nason's work was unlike that of any other engraver, for he had his own particular method of expressing himself, free



*"The Herb Gatherers," a Woodcut
by Clare Leighton (Reduced)*

from mannerisms and set techniques. One has only to study "Edge of the Pasture," "Near Lyme, Sunset," "Summer Clouds," "Tree along the Delaware," and "Village Street" to see the extent of his talent. The rolling landscape, wooded country-side, farm and rural scene, all provided him with unlimited opportunities to observe the changing aspects of New England. Although some might call him a realist, his work has been accepted and approved by all schools.

Clare Leighton, a native of London, inherited her parents' artistic talents, and at an early age developed a remarkable gift for drawing. She studied at the Brighton School of Art and at the Slade School. This led to a teaching position at the London County Council School, where she began making black and white illustrations from her father's manuscripts. She further experimented at the Central School of Arts and Crafts, striving to master graver and wood-block.

Today Miss Leighton's enormous accomplishment has placed her in the foremost rank of artists concerned with the renaissance of wood-engraving. She has the happy faculty of producing a work of art, whether interpreting nature to record her own creative ideas or as an interpreter following the word picture of an author. She possesses the power to wed her engravings to a text, and in so doing does not permit anything to interfere with her own talent. She has arrived at a point where she can select subject matter to coincide with her ideas of composition, allowing her to develop stability and firmness of design in interesting area-cutting. Thus her work may be considered "modern"; however, it is so well combined with the traditional that it has a foundation of formal pattern which produces a pictorial and symbolic content. These qualities are well demonstrated in such prints as "Breaking Camp," "Lambing," "Loading," "Lopping," and "Sheep Shearing."

Asa Cheffetz (born in Buffalo in 1897) is self-taught in wood-engraving. However, he had an excellent foundation in drawing and painting before he turned his attention to the burin and wood-block as a life's work. Matters of technique presented no hard and fast rules as he had discovered that there are many variations in nature which can be personally in-

terpreted by the artist. These interpretations are tributary, their use depending upon the mood in rendering a particular texture or atmospheric effect. In such prints as "Fish Pier," "May Sunlight," "Monday," "Vermont," and "The Village Church," one is not conscious of bondage either to the wood or engraver, but rather of the freedom of artistic interpretation. It is interesting to consider the carrying quality of these prints, as the contours of the clouds, distance, middle distance, and foreground become well-formed masses of color and atmosphere.

Fritz Eichenberg (born in Cologne, Germany, in 1901) studied at the State Academy of Graphic Arts in Leipzig and with H. Steiner-Prag. While serving as an apprentice in lithography, his youthful ambition was to become another Daumier. This stimulated his interest in print-making; a few years later, in Leipzig, he was inspired by medieval woodcuts and produced a few illustrations with moderate success.

While developing the art of wood-engraving over a period of years, Eichenberg worked as a popular cartoonist and reporter, which he found most uninspiring. One may read of his development from this point on in his own words:

So back to books and good company, and catching up with a neglected formal education in world literature. My first intriguing assignment was Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* for the Heritage Press, and meant living the tortuous life of a Raskolnikov until it yielded a crop of dramatic wood engravings. Many other challenging books followed: Brontë's *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights*, Shakespeare, Poe, Turgenev and Swift. If they were successfully illustrated, it was because the illustrations were done on wood or stone and because I struggled with the matter and substance until a crisp proof was pulled that could stand scrutiny.

As my books went out into the world, poorly, indifferently, and sometimes, but rarely, well-printed, my prints went out into print exhibitions, proof positive of what I had actually put down, engraved or lithographed.

The high standard of Eichenberg's recent work can be seen in his set of ten prints of the Old Testament, of which six were chosen for the exhibit: "And David Took a Harp," "And in her Mouth was an Olive Leaf," "And She Became a Pillar of Salt," "The Book of Job," "The Book of Jonah,"

and "The Peaceable Kingdom." These prints display a remarkable broadness, reminiscent of the graphic arts of the past. However, the artist has given the subjects a contemporary feeling of permanence. His talent is too subtle and established to be influenced by the work of either the past or present, for it possesses a real creative impulse.

Letterio Calapai, who was represented by six illustrations for Thomas Wolfe's *Look Homeward Angel*, was born in Boston in 1903. His early training was at the Massachusetts School of Art, then he studied at the Art Student's League and the Beaux Arts Institute in New York.

Calapai made many notes and drawings in 1936 in preparation for fully interpreting the force of the author's prose. The making of the blocks and the method of transferring the text in calligraphy did not take form until several years later. After much experimenting, the artist realized these illustrations in black and white wood-engravings, with accompanying texts from a copper-plate and with additional illumination or embellishment. He found that he could simplify matters by lettering backwards with a fine brush on a copper-plate, and thus created a plaque effect by etching away the background around the letters. His first experimental plate, "He Heard a Great Bell Ringing," was an immediate success. The new combination of wood-engraving and copper-plate, framing the engraved composition, may be regarded as a new contribution to the graphic arts.

Nora Unwin (a native of Surrey, England) had two outstanding and typical prints, "Warm Afternoon" and "Young Ice-lander," in the show. Her linear precision and sensitive pictorial beauty are rendered with the directness of the accomplished artist. She justly enjoys her international reputation. Grace Albee (born at Scituate, Rhode Island) produces intimate scenes surrounding her home in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Her able wood-engravings were first recognized in Paris during the early 1920's.

Other artists, who have given variety to the rebirth of wood-engraving, and whose plates enriched the exhibition were Leonard Baskin, Emil Ganso, Shirley Thompson Hadley, Hiram C. Merrill, and Charles F. Quest.

Trustees of the Library

ERWIN D. CANHAM, *President*

SIDNEY R. RABB, *Vice-President*

FRANK W. BUXTON

PATRICK F. McDONALD

RIGHT REVEREND EDWARD G. MURRAY

Director, and Librarian

MILTON EDWARD LORD

Contributors to this Issue

NORMAN S. GRABO teaches English at Michigan University. He is at work on a series of historical and literary studies on Edward Taylor.

LLOYD C. TAYLOR, JR. is an Instructor at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas.

ELLEN M. OLDHAM is Reference Librarian of the Rare Book Department; EDITH A. WRIGHT is Editorial Library Assistant; and ARTHUR W. HEINTZELMAN, etcher and painter, is Keeper of Prints at the Boston Public Library.

THE
Boston Public Library
QUARTERLY

Volume 12, Number 2

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
JOHN SINGLETON COPLEY TO HIS WIFE	67
FOURIERISM AND THE FOUNDING OF BROOK FARM <i>By Charles R. Crowe</i>	79
THE LEGEND OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT <i>By Ellen M. Oldham</i>	89
A UTRECHT BOOK OF HOURS <i>By Edith A. Wright</i>	97
THE VIRGINIA AND RICHARD EHRLICH COLLECTION	103
LOUISE I. GUINEY ON AMERICAN WOMAN POETS <i>By William L. Lucey, S.J.</i>	110
ETCHINGS AND DRAWINGS OF ARTHUR W. HEINTZELMAN <i>By Robert Taylor</i>	115
NOTES ON RARE BOOKS AND MANUSCRIPTS	
MRS. HAWTHORNE ON DICKENS <i>By Edward Wagenknecht</i>	120
A BOOK OF HOURS FROM VRELANT'S WORKSHOP <i>By Mary Castellano</i>	121
ILLUSTRATIONS	

**
*

EDITOR: ZOLTÁN HARASZTI

The Boston Public Library Quarterly is published for January, April, July and October by the Trustees of the Public Library of the City of Boston in Copley Square, Boston 17. Entered as second-class matter at Boston, Massachusetts. Printed for the Boston Public Library in May 1960.

Single Copies, 50 cents
Annual Subscription, \$2.00

THE Boston Public Library QUARTERLY

APRIL 1960

John Singleton Copley to his Wife

IN June 1774 John Singleton Copley, already a painter of great reputation throughout the colonies and recognized also in London, embarked for England, unaware that he was never to return to America. It was not his intention to emigrate. Yielding to the repeated advice of Benjamin West, the Pennsylvanian who in a few years had become one of the most successful painters in London, Copley wanted to visit the museums of Europe to get acquainted with the great art of the past. He left in Boston his wife and three small children, as well as his mother and half-brother, Henry Pelham, himself a budding artist. Apart from a few months in New York, this was the first time that he had been separated from his family. He was thirty-six years old.

A prolonged stay in Europe had been first urged upon Copley by West in August 1766, after his painting "The Boy with the Squirrel" had been exhibited in London, arousing there wide interest and resulting in his election to the Society of Artists of Great Britain. With warm generosity, West invited his young compatriot to come to Europe and, through a study of the works of the great masters, perfect his art. In his highly individual orthography he wrote: "If you could make a viset to Europe for this Porpase for three or four years, you would find yourself then in Possession of what will be highly valuable." And he added: "If ever you should make a

viset to Europe you may depend on my friendship in eny way thats in my Power to Sarve."¹

Copley assured West of the "inexpressable pleasure" which a trip to Europe would give him. "I think myself peculiarly unlucky," he noted with melancholy, "in Liveing in a place into which there has not been one portrait brought that is worthy to be call'd a Picture within my memory, which leaves me at a great loss to gess the stile that You, Mr. Reynolds, and the other Artists pracktice."²

Nevertheless, Copley was even then a well-established artist, who had some of the most distinguished personages of the colony for his sitters. So he explained to West in January 1768:

I should be glad to go to Europe, but cannot think of it without a very good prospect of doing as well there as I can here. You are sensible that three hundred Guineas a Year, which is my present income, is a pretty living in America, and I cannot think You will advise me to give it up without a good prospect of something at least equal to it, considering I must remove an infirm Mother, which must add to the difficulty and expenciveness of such [a] Voyage.³

But West persisted. Having sounded out the opinion of fellow-painters about Copley's work, he concluded that the Bostonian would "hazard nothing" by going to England. In September of the same year he returned to the subject, recommending that Copley make his visit "while young and before determin[ed] to Settle." He thought now that one year would be enough, "as you wont go in pursut of that which you are not Advanced in, but as a Satisfaction to yourself hereafter in knowing to what a length the art has been Carried to . . ." And since the settling in England would involve Copley's "little famely," West regarded it wiser if his "viset to Italy could be first accomplished."

There was, however, more than the fear of taking chances that kept Copley in Boston. Within a year he was to marry Susannah Farnum Clarke, the beautiful daughter of Richard Clarke, one of the most prominent merchants of the town. He had already bought some eleven acres on Beacon Hill, extending down to the Charles River; and he was building a house. There the young couple had a happy life on their "farm"; there

Copley painted his many portraits of church and state dignitaries.

Yet there was cause for concern, even for alarm. Ever since the spring of 1773, when Parliament empowered the East India Company to put upon the imported tea a tax to be paid by the colonists, there had been bitter indignation throughout Massachusetts Bay. The East India Company appointed Clarke, a dyed-in-the-wool loyalist, its agent in Boston. Upon the news of the shipment of tea from London, the patriots demanded Clarke's resignation, and when he refused the mob threatened to storm his warehouse. The town meeting renewed the demand, and Clarke again refused. It was in this atmosphere that the *Dartmouth* with 114 chests of tea appeared in Boston Harbor. A mass meeting attended by thousands resolved, upon the motion of Samuel Adams, that the tea should be sent back; whereupon Governor Hutchinson issued a proclamation exhorting the people, "and each of them there unlawfully assembled," forthwith to disperse. At this juncture Copley, who in spite of his family connections was not insensitive to public opinion, offered his services as mediator; his visit to the Castle, however, had no satisfactory results. New resolutions were passed against such merchants who imported tea while it was subject to duty; and the proceedings were communicated to all the sea-ports of Massachusetts, and to New York and Philadelphia. When two more tea-ships arrived, the excitement became ominous. The Governor ordered the vessels to stay, the guns of the Castle were loaded, and Admiral Montagu sent two warships to guard the Harbor. It was two days later, on December 16, that the Boston Tea Party took place.

Copley sensed the coming events — open rebellion and war with the mother country. In making his journey to see the art treasures of Europe, the idea of permanently settling in London could not be entirely absent from his mind.

Devoted to his family, he wrote from Europe long and affectionate letters to his wife and to his brother. A large part of his correspondence with the latter was contained in *Letters and Papers of John Singleton Copley and Henry Pelham, 1739-1776*, published by the Massachusetts Historical Society in 1914. The material of the volume was discovered, curiously enough,

in the Public Record Office in London. However, none of Copley's letters to his wife was in the group; evidently they remained in the family, and it was thus that Martha Babcock Amory, the artist's granddaughter, was able to incorporate parts of them into her biography, *John Singleton Copley*, published in Boston in 1882. Mrs. Amory knew nearly twenty such letters; unfortunately, for the most part she printed only fragments, and even in these took her "editorial" liberties, prettifying Copley's style. When the painter wrote that he "got" to a place, she corrected the word to "reached"; and his "stopping" there a few days became "remaining." Raphael's ashes were not to be "mixed" but "mingled" with the dust of the earth. And, of course, Copley's unorthodox spelling was all straightened out.

The editors of the Copley-Pelham letters — Guernsey Jones, Charles Francis Adams, and Worthington Chauncey Ford — took no notice of the letters published by Mrs. Amory; they included, however, two in the Mellen Chamberlain Collection of the Boston Public Library — those written on July 9 and September 15, 1774. They overlooked two others in the Chamberlain Collection, one dated November 5, 1774 and the other November 23, 1775.

These two letters are published here, apparently for the first time (apart from the paragraphs used by Mrs. Amory). As in the Copley-Pelham letters, the original spelling is observed. But whereas Copley wrote his epistles without any break, here they are split into paragraphs. He started his sentences with small letters; here the first letters are capitalized; and finally, the ampersand which Copley used is spelled out.

COPLEY'S first letter to his wife — the one of July 9th, 1774, preserved in the Boston Public Library — was written on board ship. It was wrongly date-lined as of Dover, for they actually landed at Deal. In it he informed his "ever dearest Sukey" that their crossing had been perfect, and anxiously inquired "what state the town was in."

In London he was received with great friendliness by West,

who soon introduced him to Sir Joshua Reynolds. He had "the superlative pleasure" of visiting the Royal Academy, where "the students had a naked model"! He met Lord Gage, Lord Grosvenor, and other famous men, and discovered that there was "a great deal of manly politeness in the English." However, he declined to do any portraits, feeling that he ought to see Italy first.

At the end of August he started his Continental tour. Passing through Rouen, he arrived in Paris on September 1. The pictures of the "Pallais Royale" greatly impressed him, and so did his evening at the Opera, an entirely new experience. There were more and more paintings — those of Raphael, Titian, Correggio, Veronese, Rubens, Poussin, and other masters. He wrote of them to Henry with a painter's delight and minute observation. Then through Lyons, Avignon, and Marseilles, he headed south. Genoa, with its high and richly decorated buildings, especially impressed him. "If I should be suddenly transported to Boston," he wrote his wife, "I should think it only a collection of wren boxes."⁵

In Rome, where he arrived at the end of October, a letter from his wife was waiting for him. He replied instantly. "I find you will not regret leaving Boston," he wrote. "I am sorry it has become so disagreeable; I think this will determine me to stay in England, where I have no doubt I shall meet with as much to do as in Boston, and on better terms . . ."⁶ Another letter from his wife, dated September 5, he answered in detail. This is one of the letters in the Library's possession which is printed now in full:

Rome 5th Nov.^r 1774

My Dearest Wife

I have just had the inexpressable pleasure of a kind affectionate letter from you. It is dated 5th of Sep^r and informs me of your Dear little Family's health, but you say nothing of your own. Why did you not tell me you was well if you were so. I fear you were not but I will endeavour to hope the best. By your kind letter I am relieved from very great anxiety.

By the London papers we were informed that on the 3^d of Sep^r the Ships had begun to fire on the town of Boston. Judge of my feelings on this intelligence; and although in the same paper the

Acc^t was contradicted yet I could not but feel very uneasy. Your letter is two Days later and gives me no such account and would make me very happy but that I fear you suffer great inconvenience from this difficulty of collectings the Money that is Due to me. I think it is very cruel in People to put it off when they know you cannot live without it. As to Mr. Green, I cannot express myself with that decency I would always wish to preserve, and say what I think of him. I am glad you put the business into a Lawyers hands [as] I advised you to in my last letter, and I now beg you will do in all things as you with the advice of your friends shall Judge best and I shall most certainly be pleased.

I am very fearfull Boston will soon become a place of Bloodshed and confusion, but my Dear, let me intreat you to keep up your spirits, and use every precaution for your own and Dear Childrens safety. Should any thing so terable take place I tremble when I think of my Dear friends. I wish [you] are out of the place, but I pray God to keep you all by his perpetual providence from evil of every kind, and in his good time to bring us together again. Do not my Dear Life, think the time so distant, I shall make it short if it pleases God to spare my Life. I am exceeding well and trust I shall be able to get a living in England; for I think there is but little dependance to be put on what I have in Boston. Considering my surcumstances, I shall suffer more than most People in the Dispute which I think a very great hardship.

But my Dear life the wants of life are few if we would be content with the necessarys. Perhaps we shall be obliged to live on the necessarys only; perhaps we may want even them, if we do we must make ourselves as contented as we can. We must submit with resignation to the will of God in all things; but I trust we shall not have these severe tryals. O my life I am all impatience to see you and my Dear little Babys. You have no Idea but from your own feelings what mine are. Your Dear Letter I view with pleasure; and feel ten thousand ancietys for you. When it pleases God to bring us together again I hope we shall not be seperated till Death. We never shall if I can prevent it, for I cannot be happy without you are with me. Not all the amusements this great City affoards is sufficient to make our seperation agreeable for a few months, could I consult my feelings in this, but it must be submitted to, for the present. I have been here near a fortnight. Am doing every thing possable to make my stay short. I intreat of you to keep your spirits up, and to take every care of yourself,

for my sake, for our Dear little Childrens sake. I am happy to hear of them such favourable Acc^{ts}, I pray God to Bless them with health and Virtue; keep them for me my Dear Sukey.

I am much troubled for Brother Harry. My Affection for him is very great; I pray God to keep him and give him health and all things that is good for him boath in this World and the next. I wish he had wrote by the same conveyance that brought me your kind letter. I wish you had been more particular in your Account of his health; my fears are great for him, least he should be any ways Dangerous which I am led to suspect from the Doctors advice, and his going so long a journey. I hope my fears are not well founded, give my kind love to him, and beg him to take every precaution for the recovery of his health.

Give my affectionate Love and Duty to my ever Hon^d and Dear Mother; to our Hon^d Papa, and remember me in Love to our Brother and Sister Bromfield, Brother Isaac, Brother and Sister Startin when you write to them, and request him to give my compliments to and thank Doc^r Morgan for his very kind introduction to so many worthy Gentlemen in this and other places. It contrabutes much to my happiness here to have fallen into such an acquaintance as his Letters have introduced me to. Give my Duty to Uncle and Aunt Oliver, Uncle and Aunt Winslows, and Uncle and Aunt Cabbot, and particular give my respectfull Love to Mr. and Mrs. Lee and remember me to all my friends, to Mr. Walter particularly, and to Doc^r Byles, to Mrs. Gill, and all others that think me worth inquireing after. I hope and think I have many friends in Boston, and always shall think of them with regard . . .

It is truly astonishing to see the works of Art in this City, Paintings, Sculptor, Arckitecture is so great in Quantity, Beauty, and Magnificience, as exceeds all disscription. A few Days ago I Visited the Church of ——— where I say [saw] the Transfiguration by Raphael. This Picture has been painted on board; it has always been allowed to be the best Picture in the World. When Raphael Dyed, this Picture was placed at the head of the Corps and viewed with astonishment, the work of so young Man, perfect in all its parts, an Immortal Monument to him who Lay Dead by it and was soon to be mixed with the Dust of the Earth. Raphael Dyed at the age of 37 and this Wonderfull Picture has stood to be admired, and studied, near three hundred years, and if it meets no extraordinary accident it is probable it will last many Ages to come. It is certainly a Wonderfull Peice of Art.

When I was at Florence I saw the Statue of the Venus of Medices. This statue was dug up some wheres near Rome I believe tho I am not quite sure. It has been made near two Thousand Years. And yet it is as perfect in all its parts, as Clean and fair in its Colour, as if it had been finished but a Day, and so beautifull that one stands asstonished to see how Marble could be indued with so much the appearance of real Life. I shall always, I trust enjoy a sattisfaction from this Tour I never should have had if I had not made it. I know the Extent of the Arts to What length they have been carried, and I feel more confidence in What I do myself than I did before I saw them. I hope I shall be enabled to make such a use of my Tour as will better my fortune. I wish to convey to you some Idea of St. Peters Church, but I must leave that till I am again Happy in your Dear Company.

But I must draw to a close of this letter. I think you applaud my attention in writing so constantly and such long letters, but yours are not so long as they ought to be. You might have wrote me half a sheet more in the letter [I have] just received. I beg you will not send blank paper, do write me [all you] think of. I want to know how your two makes came to leave you. I am glad to hear Readman behaves well.

I wish to know your Inclination relitive to your Coming to England, weither you would prefer it to my coming back to America or not. I wish you would write me on this head in your next. You will consider the situation of Boston, you will consider the difficultys of the Voyage, I mean the Dificultys to you in coming, and independant of my affairs say weither you would be best pleased to leave Boston till its peace is restored, or have me return and continue in it. I beg you will tell me your inclinations and I shall comply with them, as far as I can. Don't be reserved in this My Dearest Life. If Peace should be restored to America and my surcumstances would permit me to sit down on my little farm I shall certainly return to it with you from England when ever you shall wish to go to it again with pleasure. I wish to know if Harry had any Business to do after I left Boston. But my Dear Wife, Adieu, be Cheerfull, keep a good heart, trust in Heaven, and we shall be happy. Adieu, once more adieu, kiss my Babys and believe me my beloved and Dear Wife Your affectionate and Constant Husband

John Singleton Copley

COPLEY stayed in Rome till early June, 1775, thoroughly immersing himself in "the wonderful efforts of human genius." In a letter dated May 7 (which is also in the Boston Public Library) he had outlined his travel plans to John Greenwood, a London painter: "I propose to go from this [city] to Florence; from thence to Parma, Mantua, Venice, Trieste, Inspruck, Augsburg, Ulm, Stutgard, Manheim, Mayence, Coblenz, Cologne, Dusseldorf, Neimweigen, Eutrecht, Amsterdam, Harlem, Leyden, Hague, Rotterdam, Antwerp, Brussels, Ghent, Bruges, Lille, Parris, London." It was only at Parma that he wanted to stay for any considerable time, in order to copy there Correggio's St. Jerome on commission from an English nobleman.

The work took two months. It was during this time, from Parma, that he wrote some of his most tormented letters to his wife. The news of the Battle of Lexington had reached London, and from a correspondent Copley learned that the war had begun. "The country which was once the happiest on the globe," he wrote on July 2, "will be deluged for many years to come . . ." And yet the patriot that he was at heart spoke with clear confidence: "I cannot think that the power of Great Britain will subdue the country if the people are united . . . It is very evident to me that America will have the power of resistance until grown strong to conquer, and that victory and independence will go hand in hand."⁷

The rumors had it that the insurgents' army — fifteen thousand strong — was encamped around Boston, besieging it with its British garrison. The thought that the people of the town might be forced into starvation distressed Copley. He reflected, however, that their many friends would surely assist his family. "It would not surprise me to learn," he continued the letter to his wife, "that some of them, having thought it best to come to England to avoid the calamities of war, had arrived and that you were with them . . ."⁸ And so she was. On May 27, Mrs. Copley, with three of their four children, had sailed from Marblehead in the *Minerva*, the last ship to leave Massachusetts Bay under the British flag. On June 24, a week before her husband's writing, they had already arrived at

Dover. In London they were taken care of by Henry Bromfield and his wife Hannah, the sister of Mrs. Copley.

His wife's letter from England reached Copley at Parma on July 28. "I thank God," he sighed, "for the great blessing of having safely delivered you from the trying affliction to which you must have been exposed had you remained in Boston, and from the danger of the voyage.""

But the Grand Tour could not be abandoned. Knowing that his family was safe, Copley stayed on in Italy — the last stop was Venice — till the middle of November. His next letter that has been preserved (now in the Boston Public Library) was from Cologne. This, too, is printed here in full:

Cologn Nov^r 23^d. 1775.

My ever dear and beloved Wife

I promised in my last letter which was from Venice to write to you when I should arrive at Manhiem but I reachd that place two days sooner than I expected and my impatience to see you and my lovely Babes would not permit me to stop in that place more than a few hours. I got to Manheim on the twelf Day from Venice and reach'd this on the fourth from Manhiem. I shall set out this morning and hope to be at Dusseldorf to dinner, shall stay the night there, and the next morning proceed on my Journey.

My dear Angel I am now but three hundred miles from you and every hour my impatience increases once more to possess the happiness I once enjoyd with you and my dear Children. I have no words to express what my feelings are but I have that confidence in your effection that assures me you know by your own what mine are. I have now travilled in sixteen Days near eight hundred miles and I can say without any inconvenience, except that the roads are very heavy and Wet and as I approach my happiness I find them worse so that I cannot make a proportionable progress in my Journey, You must allow me from this time eleven or twelve Days. If the Roads were good I think six or seven would be sufficient.

I find such a change in the people and their manner of living from what it was ten Days ago that it almost seems as if I were at home tho their language is not what I understand. It seems an age since I heard from you, but I hope in four or five Days to meet a letter from you at Brussells, where I hope I shall then be. Ten thousand blessing attend you my Dear life and those dear Children

God has blessed me with.

I know nothing of our dear friends you left in America. I am so distressed for them that I shall not be happy so long as they are in the unhappy situation that I fear they are still in. When you write if before I get to England remember me to them in the most affectionate manner. I shall write to them immediately on my Arrival. Give my affectionate regards to Mr. and Mrs. Bromfield and the young Ladys and remember me to all friends.

But I must conclude with subscribing myself your most Affectionate Husband

J. S. Copley

THE exact date of Copley's return to London seems to be unknown. It must have been either in the last days of 1775 or in the first ones of 1776. Soon after his arrival, he moved with his family to Leicester Fields, and then purchased a house on George Street, Hanover Square. There he lived and worked for forty years — to the end of his life in 1815.

Following the example of Benjamin West, he turned much of his effort to the painting of historical scenes. The most famous of these was "The Death of Lord Chatham," now in the National Portrait Gallery in London. Another, considered second only to this, was "The Arrest of Five Members of the Commons by Charles the First," now hanging in the Treasure Room of the Boston Public Library. Acquired through subscription by a group of Bostonians, it was presented to the City in 1859. The correspondence pertaining to the purchase, the prime mover of which was Josiah Quincy, is similarly in the Library. The transaction has been described in detail in the May 1930 issue of *More Books*.

But Copley remained faithful to portraiture. He painted portraits of John Adams, John Quincy Adams, and other Americans staying in England. He himself remained an American; at one point it was even considered that he might declare himself legally "a subject of the United States." Unfortunately, he had sold his "farm" on Beacon Hill, something which he never ceased to regret. His son, John Singleton Copley, Jr., a young lawyer, came over in 1796 to represent

his interests in the sale. In a letter, also in this Library, he wrote his father:

I have thought ever since I set foot in this country that it was possible you might think of returning hither: that you would find your profession more profitable than in England I have no doubt. The state of society and of government would be more congenial to your inclinations, and nothing but the difficulty of moving seems to stand in the opposite scale.

If I had a tract of good land perhaps five thousand acres which may be purchased for no very considerable sum I would in four or five years, if it should please God to bless me with health and strength, not only render it a very valuable and productive estate but also a delightful retreat to you and my dear Mother whenever you should choose to enjoy it. Land of this kind is to be had in a good climate and within two hundred or two hundred and fifty miles from Boston and New York a distance which will continually diminish as the facility of communication owing to the rapid improvement of the Country increases.

Young Copley, himself, enjoyed immensely his stay in Boston. To be sure, he found no woman in the town "preeminently beautiful," but, as he reported to his sisters, there were "a great many very pretty, very lively, and very agreeable" ones. And after a large number of thumb-nail sketches of men and women he met, he summed up his impression: "Shall I whisper a word in your ear? The *better* people here are all Aristocrats. My father is too much a Jacobin to live among them."

Four years later his sister Elizabeth married Gardiner Greene of Boston, and came to live here. Young Copley, however, *was* an Englishman. Known later as Baron Lyndhurst, he became three times Lord Chancellor of England.

Notes

1. *Letters and Papers of John Singleton Copley and Henry Pelham, 1739-1760* (Massachusetts Historical Society, 1914), 45.
2. *Ibid.*, 51.
3. *Ibid.*, 68.
4. *Ibid.*, 72-73.
5. Martha Babcock Amory: *John Singleton Copley* (Boston, 1882), 35.
6. *Ibid.*, 37.
7. *Ibid.*, 57-58.
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ibid.*, 63.

Fourierism and the Founding of Brook Farm

By CHARLES R. CROWE

IN the summer of 1843 a blaze of enthusiasm for the socialist ideas of Charles Fourier swept through the ranks of American reformers, and one hastily-formed phalanx after another began to appear in the backlands of Pennsylvania and New York. Late in the year when the New York Fourierists met in Boston with representatives of the Brook Farm, Northampton, and Hopedale communities, the Brook Farm delegation came out solidly in support of "scientific" socialism. The official conversion of Brook Farm to socialism came after the delegates returned to West Roxbury, filled with enthusiasm for Fourierist ideas. George Ripley, the community president, appointed a committee to draw up a new constitution in January 1844, and soon the community was rechristened a phalanx. While the leaders could hardly hope to furnish the required three hundred thousand dollars and the sixteen hundred and twenty members, they were determined to follow the gospel of Fourier to the fullest possible extent in other respects.¹

Within the phalanx, all activities were to be organized in groups for specific tasks, such as plowing or shoemaking, and the groups were to be integrated into "series" in the broad divisions of industry, agriculture, domestic work, education, and recreation. This apparently rigid organization was to be created and sustained by thoroughly democratic techniques: group leaders were to be elected weekly and series leaders chosen every two months with the consent of the elected community councils; no man was to be forced into employment which was disagreeable to him, for there was to be complete freedom of work choice from hour to hour; and every member was to be guaranteed full educational rights and reasonable leisure as well as complete social security.²

The Brook Farmers accepted these ideals without reservation, and surpassed Fourier in their concern for human equality. Numerically, skilled and unskilled laborers predominated, but former ministers, teachers, farmers, clerks, and businessmen

were present, and all lived together in a remarkably harmonious social relationship. Long before the formulation of the Communist maxim, "From each according to his ability: to each according to his need," the Brook Farmers made this ideal a social reality. Inner cohesion together with able leadership and an urgent sense of mission soon made Brook Farm a center for the New England labor movement, as well as a political Mecca for American Fourierists.

The Brook Farm newspaper, *The Harbinger*, made the influence of the community felt in reform circles everywhere; John Orvis and John Allen barnstormed across New England preaching the doctrines of Fourier to anyone who would listen; Ripley and Lewis Ryckman carried the ideology of Brook Farm into the New England Workingmen's Association; and Ripley gave practical aid to the ten-hour movement, the coöperative movement, and a number of other reform drives. Above all, the belief that their efforts would provide the future social pattern for mankind gave the communitarians an exhilarating sense of being in the vanguard of historical development.

Obviously, Brook Farm during the Fourierist period was a very serious reform enterprise. Vastly different descriptions have been written about early community life as the scene of Hawthorne's barnyard labors, the antics of the "Transcendentalist heifer," Emerson's amusement at the dances where "clothespins fell merrily" to the floor from the pockets of dancing men, and, in general, the congenial Transcendentalist refuge for plain living and high thinking. Charm and vivacity were certainly a part of Brook Farm life, but was Emerson correct in describing the community as initially an escapist venture, no more than "a room at the Astor House reserved for the Transcendentalists"?³ The search for an answer to this question must begin with the writings and actions of the community's founder, George Ripley.

THE ardent reformer of Brook Farm was not visible in the conservative young minister who began his career in 1826 at the Purchase Street Unitarian Church in Boston, but Ripley's private letters and published writings after 1834 are marked

by a growing concern with reform in general and the welfare of the working classes in particular. As the misery created by the panic of 1837 increased and as the slums crept closer to the Purchase Street church, Ripley observed in his daily experience the growing evils of the industrial revolution. In 1840, disgusted by American society and disillusioned with his own church, he considered leaving the ministry and devoting his life to reform.⁴

Despite an increasing awareness of social evils, Ripley did not become a militant social reformer overnight. As late as the spring of 1840 he qualified a favorable review of Edward Palmer's communistic denunciation of American society with the observation that "the heart must be set right" before plans for a general reformation of society could be seriously considered. For a time he thought of education as a key to reform and discussed with Emerson and Bronson Alcott the possibility of establishing a new and radically different kind of university. This was one of numerous projects considered during this time, for Ripley was, as James Freeman Clarke reported, "fermenting and effervescing to a high degree with . . . ideas."⁵

By the fall of 1840 Ripley had resolved his doubts, and, rejecting Unitarianism, started a new life as a reformer. His farewell sermon began with an answer to the accusation that he had brought "politics" into the church. He insisted that the conscientious Christian must fight in the cause of social reform. The minister's responsibilities were especially heavy, for he was by the nature of his mission a man "hostile to all oppression of man by man" and constantly sympathetic to "the down-trodden and suffering poor." Ripley denounced the church-attending Philistines for denying Christian equality and failing to understand that the true Christian church was "a band of brothers who attach no importance whatever to the petty distinctions of birth, rank, wealth, and situation." He also advised his parishioners that if they and their kind had done their Christian duty there would be no oppression, slavery, war, executions, jails, violence, or ruthless business competition.⁶

Even before the final parting from his church, Ripley was planning a reform community as an antidote for current social

evils. The comments of many Boston intellectuals leave little room for doubt as to the seriousness of the West Roxbury venture. Samuel Osgood referred to Ripley's project as "a New Harmony," and Margaret Fuller revealed her conception of the community when she gave as her reason for refusing to join the Brook Farmers the belief that "we are not yet ripe to reconstruct society." Shortly after the community had been established, Osgood denounced "this cursed system of civilization" and praised Ripley for attempting to change it. Other sympathizers made similar remarks praising Ripley's reform efforts.⁷

Those who are sometimes cited to suggest that Brook Farm was established as an educational experiment, a religious action, or a Transcendentalist escape into the wilderness that had little relevance to American society, when properly read often give evidence for the reformist nature of the community. John Humphrey Noyes, working on the mistaken notion that William Ellery Channing was indirectly responsible for the Brook Farm enterprise, did once describe the community as "a child of Unitarianism," but in *A History of American Socialisms*, he took Emerson to task for failing to understand fully Ripley's radical reform motives. Even Emerson, who was reluctant to praise and had privately referred to Brook Farm as "a Transcendentalist picnic," considered joining the community, admitted the seriousness and utility of Ripley's plans, and after refusing "painfully, slowly" and almost guiltily to join, took Bronson Alcott's family into his house as a substitute for the "bolder" venture. In later years Emerson paid tribute to Ripley's efforts to create a classless society by admitting that Brook Farm had been "a close union like that in a ship's cabin of persons in various conditions: clergymen, young collegians, merchants, mechanics, farmers' daughters . . ."⁸

Certainly Ripley's initial proposals for the new Jerusalem were quite specific. He wished to "insure a more natural union between intellectual and manual labor" by educating the worker and giving the intellectual physical labor to perform; to secure for workers "the fruits of their labor" which the capitalist in American society often plundered; to do away with class barriers; and to create a society of equals living in brotherly

relation without poverty, ignorance, or social hatreds. The first community constitution did list several purposes, but obviously the central one was a determination

to establish the external relations of life on a basis of wisdom . . . to apply the principles of justice and love to our Social Organization . . . to substitute a system of brotherly co-operation for one of selfish competition . . . to institute an attractive, efficient and productive system of industry . . . to diminish the desire of excessive accumulation by making the acquisition of individual property subservient to upright and disinterested uses.⁹

From the very beginning the community represented an attempt to create a model for the total reformation of society, and the goals of the Brook Farm Institute and the Brook Farm Phalanx were almost identical. Socialism did, however, bring some new patterns. Fourierism gave Brook Farmers a crusading spirit and a new sense of participation in a Providential movement which was world-wide in scope. The "Associationists" were stimulated intellectually by the possession of a cosmology and an infallible guide to "scientific" socialism. The Fourierist period was also characterized by flamboyant rites and symbols, plays and symbolic decorations, Fourier birthday celebrations, and the ritual devised for Christian socialism by the "religious associationists."

However, the early Brook Farmers had their costumes, rituals, and contempt for "civilizees," and the fact remains that the changes of 1844 were not really basic ones. From the beginning Brook Farm was intensely collectivistic and equalitarian. The rules of common and equal wages, diet, housing, leisure, and educational rights prevailed in 1841 as well as in 1844. While the formal structure of groups and series was lacking at first, organizational patterns were strikingly similar, and the same democratic attitudes existed permitting choice of employment and election of work leaders. Even Fourier's emphasis on social harmony and the integration of the individual personality was a cardinal principle in the early Brook Farm credo. J. T. Codman, perhaps the best reporter in that large and vocal company of former community members, stressed the continuity between the two phases of community history. "Integral education," "attractive industry," "honors according

to usefulness," and "co-operative labor," Codman insisted, were accepted so readily because their essences had been a part of Brook Farm life long before the coming of Fourierism.¹⁰

Surely the remarkable continuity between the "Transcendentalist" and the Fourierist periods requires an explanation. Was Brook Farm from the beginning a thinly veiled Fourierist Phalanx? Few scholars have been willing to consider this possibility, and a number of Ripley's contemporaries did not mention Fourier at all in discussing the origins of Brook Farm. John Humphrey Noyes was willing to concede only that "the beginnings of Fourierism may have secretly affected" the founders. One self-appointed propagandist for Brook Farm, Elizabeth Peabody, gave no credit to Fourier in her extensive accounts of the community.¹¹ J. T. Codman admitted the striking similarity of Fourierist ideas to those advocated by Ripley in 1841, but he knew nothing of the circumstances surrounding the coming of Fourierism and, searching for an explanation, could only suggest that Ripley "had fallen unwittingly . . . on ideas that coincided with those of Charles Fourier. There was an agreement between them unknown at the start."¹²

To make the matter more difficult, there were other possible sources for Ripley's communitarian ideas. In 1838 he visited the Shaker and Zoarite communities and was impressed by an air of common purpose, high community morale, and the lack of invidious distinctions which characterized life in these communities. This was an age of religious rebellion, and the "come-outer" impulse also played a part in the actions of the communitarians. Elizabeth Peabody, for whom Brook Farm meant "A Glimpse of Christ's Idea of Society," suggested that "in order to live a religious and moral life worthy of the name," the Brook Farmers felt it "necessary to come out in some degree from the world, and to form themselves into a community of property." Finally there was a vein of Locofocoism in Transcendentalist ideology which helped to create a climax of opinion favorable to communal experiments.¹³

UNDOUBTEDLY, all these forces influenced Ripley and his associates, but an adequate explanation of the Brook Farm

way cannot be constructed from these materials, and the suggestions of Fourierist influence are too strong to be ignored. Moreover, adequate evidence exists to prove that Ripley was familiar with Fourier's ideas from an early date. His introduction to the subject may have come through Emerson, who discussed Fourierist concepts on the lecture platform in 1838 and returned repeatedly to the subject afterwards in the *Journals*. Since Ripley attended Emerson's lectures faithfully and saw him both socially and at meetings of the Transcendentalist Club, the conjecture is a likely one. Concrete and undeniable testimony on Ripley's early knowledge of Fourierism can be found in the writings of Samuel Osgood, a Boston intellectual on the fringes of the Transcendentalist movement, and Orestes A. Brownson, one of Ripley's closest friends. In September 1840 Osgood reported that "the New Light Socialists" were discussing Fourierism in formulating their communitarian plans. This opinion was confirmed early in 1842 by Brownson.¹⁴

At a meeting of the Transcendentalist Club late in the summer of 1840 Ripley vigorously defended the socialist ideal, and in the October 1840 issue of *The Dial* he reviewed favorably Albert Brisbane's *The Social Destiny of Man*, which was to become the Bible of the American Fourierists. Ripley described Fourier as one of the greatest thinkers of all time on social problems and their solutions. While he maintained that too many details of this plan were adjusted to the peculiarities of the French character, he freely admitted that the ultimate reorganization of society would have to begin with the foundations provided by Fourier. By 1843 Ripley's socialism was so orthodox that Albert Brisbane and Horace Greeley brought him, at a conference in Albany, New York, into the inner circle of leaders who planned the most ambitious project of American Fourierism, the North American Phalanx.¹⁵

In 1847 Ripley boasted that the first meeting in New England to discuss Fourierism was held in his house on Bedford Street during the fall of 1840. He also provided in 1844 an explanation of his failure to publicize Fourierist ideas during the early phase of Brook Farm history: "It has been thought that a steady endeavor to embody these ideas more and more perfectly in life would give the best answer, both to the hopes

of the friendly and the cavils of the sceptical, and furnish in its results the surest ground for any larger effort . . . [Meanwhile] every step has strengthened the faith with which we set out."¹⁶

Thus there can be no doubt that Ripley was versed in Fourierism and that the concepts of the French socialists had an impact on the formation of the community. The extent of the early influence can be seen in the easy transformation of the Brook Farm Institute into the Brook Farm Phalanx without accusations, resignations, or a single public protest — indeed, so far as the historian can tell, without private objections. At the same time it is obvious that if the community had been established along strictly Fourierist lines, more would have been written about the fact by Ripley, Emerson, and J. S. Dwight, and the conversion of 1844 would have been pointless.

The early Fourierist influence was real enough, but its precise forms are difficult to single out, particularly because of the Transcendentalist background of most Brook Farmers. There are a number of instances in which an idea or communal pattern can be traced to either Fourierism or Transcendentalism. Both Fourier and Emerson, for example, shared a concern for the maximum development of human nature, and the Brook Farmers might have drawn their inspiration from either. In other cases Fourierist origins are more easily discerned. Emerson objected to the splintering of the individual personality by modern specialization, and Ripley's passion for uniting the thinker and the worker may have had roots in Transcendentalist ideology. Still, Fourier and the Brook Farmers went beyond this. They wished to overcome class divisions and to make society as well as the individual personality a harmonious whole. Fourier and Ripley sought more than the best circumstances for spontaneous living; and their social objectives of free choice of employment for every member of society, ample wages for workers, and universal social security were hardly central objects of concern for the most famous Transcendentalists. Emerson wished to celebrate the aesthetic virtues of common things, but the determination of Ripley to dignify manual labor cannot be traced plausibly to Transcendentalism. Both the author of the first Brook Farm constitution and Fourier used the phrase "attractive labor," and so similar were the two

explanations of the doctrine that only the Fourierist jargon kept them from being identical.

The ideology of the Brook Farm leaders was from the beginning closer to Fourierism than to Transcendentalism, and the force of "Associationist" dogmas grew gradually until the reorganization of the community as a Phalanx took place in 1844. While the Fourierist influence was weaker in 1841 than in 1844, it did exist and had great significance in Ripley's plan "to improve the race of man" by building a socialist community which would be "a beacon light over this country and this age."

Notes

1. *The Present* (New York), Jan. 15, 1844; Brook Farm Minutes and Resolutions Book, Massachusetts Historical Society; *Constitution of the Brook Farm Association*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1844).

2. On Fourierism at Brook Farm, see J. T. Codman, *Brook Farm* (Boston, 1894); Zoltán Haraszti, *The Idyll of Brook Farm* (Boston, 1937); Marianne Dwight, *Letters from Brook Farm*, ed. Amy L. Reed (Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 1928); and *The Harbinger* (Brook Farm and New York).

3. Emerson, *Journals*, eds. E. W. Emerson and R. W. Forbes (New York, 1910-12), V. 474. Many writers have clung to the notion that Brook Farm was in the beginning an escapist venture or at least an impractical reform enterprise. Everett Weber in *Escape to Utopia* (New York, 1959), 170-92, presented Ripley as a man of good intentions and somewhat Quixotic plans and Brook Farm as in large part a product of "the Newness," the "lunatic fringe" of Transcendentalism. While admitting that for Ripley the community "appeared" to be a "serious solution," Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. argued that "a fairer and more chaste maiden in the vision of Brook Farm . . . saved" Ripley "from the worldly life of [practical] politics." *The Age of Jackson* (Boston, 1946), p. 384. J. H. Wilson in "The Antecedents of Brook Farm," *New England Quarterly*, XV (1942), 320-31, emphasized educational ends. Several sources which on first notice seem to suggest the supremacy of educational ends should be mentioned. An article in *The Monthly Miscellany of Religion and Letters*, May 1841, 293-5 presented the community as a genteel experiment in liberal education, but the author wished to smooth over conflicts generated by Ripley's angry departure from the ministry. A notice by Ripley in *The Phalanx* on October 5, 1843, which stressed the school, was an attempt to bring in badly needed funds for industrial expansion. Article II of the 1841 constitution emphasized the school in order to attract investors and meet the legal needs for incorporation.

4. See O. B. Frothingham, *George Ripley* (Boston, 1882); and Charles R. Crowe, "George Ripley: Transcendentalist and Utopian Socialist," Ph.D. thesis, Brown University, 1955.

5. Ripley, a review of Palmer's "A Letter to Those who Think," *The Dial*, I (1840), 253; F. B. Sanborn and W. T. Harris, *A. Bronson Alcott* (Boston, 1893), II, 507-8; and J. F. Clarke, *Autobiography* (Boston, 1891), 133.

6. Ripley to J. S. Dwight, Boston, July 7, 1840, Boston Public Library (hereafter B.P.L.); Ripley, *A Farewell Discourse to the Congregational Church in Purchase Street* (Boston, 1840).

7. Osgood to J. S. Dwight, Boston, November 21, 1840, B.P.L.; Fuller to W. H. Channing, Boston, October 28, 1840, B.P.L.; and Osgood to J. S. Dwight, Boston, April 9, 1841, B.P.L.

8. Emerson, *Journals*, V, 474; Charles E. Norton, ed., *The Correspondence of Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston, 1887), II, 409; Frothingham, *Ripley*, 312; W. H. Channing, *The Life of William Ellery Channing* (Boston, 1882), 346; and Noyes, *A History of American Socialisms* (Philadelphia, 1870), 527.

9. Frothingham, *Ripley*, 310; and *Brook Farm Institute of Agriculture and Education* (Boston, 1841).

10. Codman, *Brook Farm*, 29-34.

11. Noyes, *American Socialisms*, 104. Noyes lacked reliable information and Elizabeth Peabody was trying to convert "liberal" Christians.

12. Codman, *Brook Farm*, 25-29.

13. "A Letter from Zoar, Ohio," *The Dial*, II (1842), 342-48. [The article was published under Sophia Ripley's name but it represented Ripley's views very well.] Peabody, "A Glimpse of Christ's Idea of Society," *The Dial*, II (1842), 361. Transcendentalist "reason," a direct and certain intuitive road to wisdom and truth in contrast to the uncertain and probable "understanding," gave George Bancroft faith in the "infallible" judgment of the people and provided a reform rationale for Ripley, Dwight, and others.

14. James E. Cabot, *A Memoir of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston, 1887), II, 386-7; Emerson, *Journals*, VI, 473, VII, 306-7, 392, 396, 443; Osgood to J. S. Dwight, Boston, November 21, 1840, B.P.L.; and Brownson, "Brook Farm," *Democratic Review*, m.s., XI (1842), 481-96. Both Osgood and Brownson indicated that Brook Farm was not specifically planned as a Fourierist institution.

15. Elizabeth Peabody to J. S. Dwight, September 20, 1840, B.P.L.; Ripley, a review [erroneously ascribed by G. W. Cooke to Emerson] of Brisbane's "The Social Destiny of Man," *The Dial*, I (1840), 265-66.

16. Records of the Religious Union of Associationists, October 16, 1847 entry, Massachusetts Historical Society. These records contain other references to Ripley's early knowledge of Fourierism.

The Legend of Alexander the Great

By ELLEN M. OLDHAM

THROUGHOUT the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance the legends of Alexander the Great were told in hundreds of manuscripts, not only in Greek and Latin but in all languages, from Bulgarian to Icelandic and from Scottish to Ethiopian. These manuscripts may be traced to three sources: the *Anabasis* of the Greek historian Arrian; the "literary" histories of Orosius, Quintus Curtius Rufus, and Diodorus Siculus; and the romantic folklore of popular traditions. The latter were combined, probably in the third century A. D., into a continuous narrative by the so-called "Pseudo-Callisthenes," an unknown author of Alexandria. The writer's objective may have been to claim Alexander for Egypt, by making him the son of an Egyptian king. His story, however, owed its ever-increasing popularity to its wealth of strange and marvelous tales.

The oldest volume in the Boston Public Library devoted to an account of Alexander's exploits is a thirteenth-century copy of the *Alexandreis sive Gesta Alexandri Magni* by Gautier (Gualterius) de Châtillon, an epic poem in ten books written in hexameters. Gautier, born in Lille in the second half of the twelfth century, studied in Paris and afterwards taught school at Châtillon, in Burgundy. He served as secretary to William, Archbishop of Rheims and Regent of France during the third crusade. It was at the latter's request that he undertook the composition of his *Alexandreis*. As a reward, he was made a canon of the church at Amiens.

The poem, modeled on the *Aeneid*, is a versification of the *Historiae Alexandri Magni* by Quintus Curtius Rufus. Full of long monologues and interminable discourses, it was widely read during the Middle Ages, being preferred even to the classical epics. The first printed edition appeared at Rouen about 1487, followed by two others. It contains the famous lines "Incidis in cillam cupiens vitary caribdim" (V, 311) "You fall into Scylla, trying to avoid Charybdis."

Though there are numerous manuscripts of the *Alexandreis* extant, the *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, published by Seymour De Ricci in 1935, listed only two copies besides that of the Boston Public Library, then both in the hands of a private collector. The Library's copy was written in Northern France, and comprises 100 leaves of vellum, thirty-two lines to a page, with red capitals at the beginning of each book. There are innumerable interlinear glosses in a medieval hand and, curiously enough, leaves 31 to 42, containing less than a hundred lines, were left partly blank to receive extensive annotations. In some instances only a line or two of text appears on a page; however, only seven of the pages were annotated.

The volume once belonged to the library of the Earl of Ashburnham (1797-1878), who had purchased the entire manuscript collection of Joseph Barrois, a well-known French bibliographer, in 1849. This collection became the subject of a famous scandal when it was learned that a number of the volumes, as those of Guillaume Libri, a supervisor of the French public libraries, had been stolen from the Bibliothèque Nationale and other libraries. Most of the books were returned to France by the son of the Earl of Ashburnham, before the library was sold at auction in 1901.

Tipped in the Library's *Alexandreis* — which, unfortunately, does not seem distinguished enough to have been part of the loot — is a letter to Lord Ashburnham by Dr. John Holmes, Assistant Keeper in the Department of Manuscripts of the British Museum. Asked to identify an Alexander book without actually seeing it, Holmes, writing in 1852, mentions the British Museum's copies of the two Latin versions of Pseudo-Callisthenes, giving the first line of each and ending his letter: "If the Barrois Ms. does not agree with either of these, will your Lordship send me the first two or three lines? I have a faint idea that the Barrois will be found to be Julius Valerius." To be sure, the Barrois collection included several Alexander books besides the *Alexandreis*, among them a copy of Valerius's *Res Gestae*.

Before turning to the volumes derived from the more elaborate and fanciful work of the Pseudo-Callisthenes, the early



*Frontispiece of "Alexander the Great" (Strassburg, 1493)
(Reduced)*

chronicle accounts of Alexander to be found in the Boston Public Library should be mentioned. From the Ashburnham Collection comes a twelfth-century manuscript of Peter Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*. Comester, who like Gautier de Châtillon was a *protégé* of Archbishop William of Rheims, devotes a long passage to Alexander. However, the longest of all medieval accounts is that in the *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais, filling some thirty folio pages of the third and fourth books. Here, as elsewhere in his great *Speculum Majus*, Vincent's method was to gather together all the available historical and legendary sources, in chronological order. Thus the story is filled with contradictory statements, borrowed from conflicting authors.

The Library has two copies of the 1474 edition of *Speculum Historiale*, published at the Monastery of SS. Ulrich and Afra at Augsburg, and also Volumes III and IV of the 1473 edition printed by Johann Mentelin at Strassburg. Ranulph Higden, the English monk, made extensive use of Vincent of Beauvais's account in his *Polychronicon*. The Library's copy is of the second edition of the English version of this work, printed by Wynkyn de Worde at Westminster in 1495.

TWO Latin translations of the Pseudo-Callisthenes are known. The earlier, by Julius Valerius, was made about 340 A. D., with a tenth-century abridgment known as the *Epitome* of Valerius. The second, prepared by a certain Leo, Archpriest of Naples in the tenth century, is usually referred to as *Historia de Praeliis* ("History of Battles"). This second version was frequently printed in the fifteenth century, the first edition appearing at Cologne in 1472. The Boston Public Library has a copy of the fourth edition.

The *Historia de Praeliis* was translated into German about 1440 by Johann Hartlieb at Munich. Printed at Augsburg in 1473 with the title *Das Buch der Geschicht des Grossen Allexanders*, the work went through half a dozen editions before the end of the century. The Library has a splendid copy of the 1493 Strassburg edition. The book has a striking full-page portrait of the youthful Alexander for frontispiece and twenty-

seven large woodcuts in the text. The woodcuts were copies, in reverse, of those used by Anton Sorg at Augsburg. Spirited in movement, they mostly depict battle-scenes.

The frontispiece is undoubtedly by a sophisticated artist, a master of the flowing line. It shows Alexander seated on a dais covered with flowers, looking over the parapet of his castle towards a far-away landscape. The first cut in the text represents the Egyptians worshipping an idol, as Nectanabus steals away to the left. Threatened by invasion from Persia, the King prudently fled to Macedonia and, in the absence of King Philip, presented himself as a sooth-sayer to Queen Olympias. Announcing that she will be visited by the god Ammon in the shape of a dragon, Nectanabus assumes such a form by his magic, and from his union with the queen is born the child Alexander. Alexander himself is first shown in the famous episode of the horse Bucephalus. This beautiful fierce horse had been presented to Philip with the prophecy that whoever should tame it should succeed to the throne. So savage was the beast that condemned men were thrown into its cage to be devoured. But Alexander, happening upon the cage one day, admired the animal and reached out his hand to pet it. Not only did the beast allow the young prince to stroke its mane, but it bent its knees and bowed before him! As shown in the woodcut, Bucephalus seems to resemble a lion rather than a horse.

Then follows the epic of Alexander's conquests — his invasion of Syria, Persia, India, and Babylonia. He met the Queen of the Amazons and the mermaids who enticed men into the water; fought against four hundred elephants; encountered horrible serpents, scorpions, crocodiles, and dragons; and the magic tree of the sun in India prophesied his early death. One of the most exciting of the battle illustrations shows the siege of Tyre, the burning city in the background and the army in front. A soldier stands on the body of a woman and holds up a child to slay it; in the upper-right corner two men hang from a gibbet. In India the Greek forces were opposed by King Porus, with his great elephants, each of which had a "howdah" from which the soldiers could shoot their enemies. But Alexander, the story goes, knew all about elephants, having read of them in the old chronicles as a child; and so he had copper bul-

lets fastened to long sticks, which were heated and thrust into the elephants' trunks. The beasts panicked, and Alexander's men carried the day.

Among the purely legendary exploits of the historical Alexander none are more fascinating than the accounts of his flight through the air in a chair drawn by griffins and his descent into the ocean. According to Hartlieb's text, the latter feat was accomplished in a chest of oiled ox hides, bound with iron bands and "with many windows, built with the greatest skill so that no water could come in." The quaint woodcut shows a tiny Alexander in his box — made small, of course, to indicate the great depth of the water — with a servant holding the other end of the chain. In the last illustration Alexander lies on his deathbed, surrounded by servants and courtiers.

Popular interest in the tales about Alexander the Great continued into the sixteenth century, and the Boston Public Library has a second example of Hartlieb's translation of the *Historia de Praeliis*, printed by Mathias Hüpfuff in 1514, also at Strassburg. This edition is illustrated with two full-page woodcuts and 93 smaller ones. The frontispiece, like that of the fifteenth-century copy, shows Alexander as a young man seated on a throne. He is dressed in a cloak, his long hair arranged in ringlets; on one side he is flanked by four philosophers and on the other, by three knights in armor. The cut is repeated on the verso of leaf 46, there representing Ptolomaeus receiving the young knight Candeleus. On the verso of the last leaf is the other full-page wood-cut, that of the author offering his book to a king.

The woodcuts in the text run the width of the page and are often made up of two or three blocks. Although the text is the same as in the earlier edition, many more of the incidents are illustrated. The series begins with Nectanabus on his throne, and includes eight pieces relating to events after Alexander's death. There are lively scenes of besieged towns and of headlong charges by opposing armies, and there are pictures of some of the monsters which Alexander saw on his journeys.

THE French, too, were fascinated with the wonderful tales.

A French version of the *Historia de Praeliis* was made in the second half of the thirteenth century. Omitting some material and utilizing the methods of the old romances, the unknown translator produced an amusing courtly narrative, the most successful of the medieval prose versions. It was printed eleven times between 1506 and 1630. The Library has an undated copy issued by Olivier Arnoullet of Lyons. Its title-page, in red and black, reads: "Icy comence lhystoire du tres vaillant noble pieux et hardy roy Alexandre le grant iadis roy et seigneur de tout le monde." Below the title is a large woodcut in which names identify King Philip, his wife Olympias, and the young Alexander. There are many woodcuts in the text, apparently copied from German originals.

A new scene, not present in the German editions, is the one where Alexander throws Nectanabus into a moat to drown. It was proper for the old man to die — the narrative maintains — because, not content with knowing terrestrial things, he wanted to pry into celestial secrets "with which no wise man ought to meddle." To be sure, Alexander had not yet learned that Nectanabus was his father. In the woodcut of Bucephalus the two horns from which the animal derived its name (ox-headed) are prominent, and in the cage one can see a skull, a hand, a foot, and other remains of its victims. The rest of the pictures, especially those showing medieval armed knights in tourney or battle, are typical of sixteenth-century book illustration. The volume is bound in brown calf over wooden boards, stamped with fleurs-de-lis.

A Utrecht Book of Hours

By EDITH A. WRIGHT

THE Boston Public Library has a collection of some fifteen manuscript Books of Hours produced in France, England, Holland, and Italy, and displaying the characteristic styles of their periods and countries of origin. Recently a new example of a distinctive type has been acquired, made in the northern Netherlands, with the text in Dutch. Dated about 1480, it consists of 155 vellum leaves, measuring $6\frac{1}{2}$ by $4\frac{3}{4}$ inches. The writing is in dark brown ink, in a handsome, legible Gothic script, nineteen lines to the page. The binding is eighteenth-century red morocco, with elaborate gilt decoration on the covers and spine. In the catalogue of the A. J. Beresford Hope Sale of 1882, in which Sotheby, Wilkinson and Hodge were the auctioneers, the volume is listed as "lot 238."

The manuscript is illustrated with three full-page miniatures and five smaller ones, with thirty-five illuminated borders and countless decorated initials, and every page has several small capitals in gold, red or blue. The colors have retained their freshness and the gold still gleams brightly.

Following the Calendar, which is not illustrated, come the Hours of the Virgin, beginning with a large "H." In the center, against a dark red background and supported by a crescent moon, is the Virgin in a blue robe, with gold crown and halo, holding the Christ Child.

Next come the Hours of Eternal Wisdom, preceded by a full-page illustration of Christ on the Mount of Olives. He is shown clad in a pale purple robe, kneeling in prayer before a high rock on top of which a golden chalice is set. Behind Him are three sleeping disciples, while a band of armed soldiers is approaching the garden gate. The background portrays a rolling country-side, with the old cathedral of Utrecht in the distance, its tower clearly recognizable from pictures.¹ The sky is a deep blue shading to white below, a characteristic of Dutch miniatures of the fifteenth century.² On the opposite page is a round, two-pronged capital "M" against a background

of burnished gold. In the center Christ stands, holding an open book in one hand and raising the other in admonition.

The Hours of the Cross are preceded by a full-page Crucifixion. The background is similar to that of the Gethsemane miniature, with the same pale green mountains, little round trees and yellow path. Jesus' head, bearing the crown of thorns, hangs forward, the eyes closed and an expression of agony on His face. On one side of the cross stand Mary and St. John, on the other, a ruffian in a lavender cloak and two soldiers in blue armor. A bone sticks out of the earth at the foot of the cross.

Opposite this illustration is a capital "O" with a miniature of Christ as Man of Sorrows. Standing in a tomb, He is clad in a loincloth and holds the rod and scourge. Behind Him are the other instruments of the Passion — spear, sponge, ladder, nails, and chalice. Over Christ's head is an open box, full of gold coins, representing the money received by Judas. Six heads are shown in the left background, among them a white-bearded saint, a woman, a king, and a bishop. In the outer corners of the page are two angels, one bearing the scourging-pillar, the other a cross. This illustration is of rare occurrence in Books of Hours from other countries, but it occurs in two fifteenth-century Dutch manuscripts in the library.

The Seven Hours of the Holy Ghost follow, beginning with a capital "H" which encloses a miniature of Moses receiving the Tables of the Law. Next come the Seven Penitential Psalms. These are preceded by a full-page picture of the Last Judgment. Christ is seated on a rainbow, his feet resting on a blue globe. The cloak thrown around His shoulders reveals the wound in His side; the nail-holes in His feet and hands are also visible. One hand is held out in blessing; the other in a gesture of rejection. The upper half of the background is of burnished gold, surmounting a shaded sky. Five tiny naked figures are shown rising out of the earth, and in the foreground the Virgin and John the Baptist (?) kneel in prayer.

Facing the Judgment scene is a capital "H," framing the penitent David with his crown and harp on the ground. In the upper right-hand corner of the page is St. Barbara with her tower and book; in the lower corner, Mary Magdalene is hold-

ing the usual jar of ointment and a whip-lash with three hooks. The remainder of the book, including litanies, prayers, and the Vigils of the Dead, is not illustrated. Of the four prayers, one is to the Holy Trinity, and the rest are for recitation at various points during Mass.

The illuminated borders are of a type common in the northern Netherlands in the fifteenth century. Graceful vine-tendrils in brown pen-work support small green leaves and an abundance of small gold "carbuncles," trefoils, etc. Mingled with these are birds, flowers, and fruits, such as strawberries, columbines, and carnations. Several of the borders also have acanthus leaves. The Calendar has a decorated gold "KL" for each month, and bright blue and gold ornaments fill the empty spaces in the litanies.

IF the style of the illustrations narrows the field of origin to the northern Netherlands, the Calendar places the volume specifically in the diocese of Utrecht, a location already suggested by the picture of the old cathedral of St. Martin. Although the Calendar indicates a saint for every day of the year, the names in red which denote the feasts of obligation make identification possible. A. W. Byvanck, in *La Miniature dans les Pays-Bas Septentrionaux* (Paris, 1939) lists fourteen feasts which denote a Utrecht origin, and all of them occur in the Library's manuscript. Those of Saints Willibrord, Martin, and Lebuin (on November 7, 11, and 12 respectively) make the locality certain. Willibrord was one of the evangelizers of the northern Netherlands and became bishop of Utrecht in the eighth century; St. Martin had churches dedicated to him in Utrecht and Groningen, and St. Lebuin in Arnhem and Deventer. However, several of the distinctive saints of the Flemish Netherlands, such as St. Vaast and St. Omer, are either lacking in the manuscript or are listed in blue. The name of St. Jerome appears in red, suggesting a possible connection with the Brotherhouse of St. Jerome in Utrecht.³

As is well known, Books of Hours vary in content, yet most of them share a common nucleus. The present volume includes all the usual features, except the Gospel extracts and the two

prayers to the Virgin, "Obsecro te" and "O intemerata." The Offices of the Cross and of the Holy Ghost occur in a longer form, with three lessons and psalms for each hour.

In addition, the Hours of Eternal Wisdom is common in Dutch Books of Hours but is rarely encountered elsewhere. Victor Leroquais, who catalogued the Books of Hours in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, does not mention it in his discussion of their contents, nor does Edmund Bishop in his article "On the Origin of the Primer" in *Liturgica Historica*. None of the general studies of the Books of Hours seen by the present writer refers to it.⁴ On the other hand, it is found in more than half of the 108 Books of Hours from the Northern Netherlands described by Byvanck in his *Miniature Hollandaise et les MSS Illustrés du XIV^e au XVII^e Siècle aux Pays-Bas Septentrionaux* (The Hague, 1922-26, 3 vols.). It occurs also in a second fifteenth-century Dutch Book of Hours owned by the Boston Public Library.

THE Office of Eternal Wisdom is attributed to the German mystic Henry Suso (1295-1366).⁵ Suso's name was originally Heinrich von Berg, but he adopted his mother's family name. Born in Swabia, he entered a Dominican monastery in Constance at the age of thirteen. Five years later, while listening to a reading from Proverbs in the refectory, he had an ecstatic vision of Eternal Wisdom, and from that time he dedicated himself to her service, in a spirit akin to that of medieval chivalry or the Minnesingers of his native land. At first he pictured Eternal Wisdom in feminine form, as the mystical bride of the soul, but later, inspired by the Epistles of St. Paul, he equated her with Jesus.

From 1324 to 1327, Suso studied theology under the "saintly master," Johann Eckhart, in Cologne. His two most important works are the *Little Book of Eternal Wisdom*, composed about 1328, and the *Horologium Sapientiae*, about 1334. The prologue of the earlier work tells how a preacher stood in front of the crucifix after Matins, complaining to God that he was unable to meditate on His sufferings.⁶ God answered him, "and a conversation with Eternal Wisdom began within him." In

order to help others, he wrote down his meditations, in German, "since they were revealed to him by God in that manner." "The ideas here expressed," he says, "are simple, and the words even simpler, for they proceed from a simple soul, and are meant for simple persons who still have failings to overcome." The book is presented in the form of a dialogue between Eternal Wisdom and her Servant. The *Horologium* is an expansion of the same ideas in Latin; the Library owns a copy of the edition published in Cologne in 1496. Suso's works became extremely popular throughout Europe, rivalling even the *Imitatio Christi*.

An Office of Divine Wisdom appears in some manuscripts of the *Horologium* and was published with it in the Cologne edition of 1555 (now said to be lost), but it is not included in the 1496 edition.⁷ The Office (sometimes Hours) is made up for the most part of liturgical passages, but also contains non-liturgical elements in the form of prayers, written by Suso.⁸ Although it was originally composed in Latin, it was most popular in a Dutch translation. In the volume here described, the Office for Matins consists of an invitory, hymn, psalm, anthem, versicle, and three lessons, each with response and versicle, concluding with the *Te Deum*. Lauds has two psalms, a hymn, anthem, capitule, versicle, and collect; the other hours are similar, but have only one psalm. The Office ends "May the Eternal Wisdom bless us and preserve our hearts and our bodies."

In the fifteenth century Suso's works were spread through the Netherlands by the Brothers of the Common Life. This order, which supported itself largely by the copying and illumination of books, produced many copies of the *Horologium*.⁹ Thomas à Kempis, most famous of the Brothers, read and admired the book, as did Gerhart Groote, the founder of the order.¹⁰ In a letter to his friend Johann Cele, rector at the school at Zwolle, Groote agreed to exchange a copy of the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas for one of the *Horologium*, but urged Cele to cause an accurate copy of the latter to be made "for the honor of God."¹¹

Since the Brothers of the Common Life were chiefly responsible for the wide-spread diffusion of Books of Hours in the

Dutch language, it is not surprising that the Hours of Eternal Wisdom occur so frequently in them. The fact that most of the contents of the Library's manuscript are in a Dutch translation supposedly by Groote and that Suso's Office is included suggests that the volume was a product of one of the houses of the Brotherhood, possibly that of St. Jerome in Utrecht.

Notes

1. The cathedral also appears in a Utrecht manuscript of 1450 (A. W. Byvanck, *La Miniature dans les Pays-Bas Septentrionaux*, Paris 1939, Plate LXIV, fig. 180). The Cathedral church of St. Martin was erected in the thirteenth century. The nave was destroyed by a hurricane in 1674, and never restored.

2. David Diringer, *The Illuminated Book*, London [1958], p. 431.

3. Willem Vogelsang, *Holländische Miniaturen des Späteren Mittelalters*, Strassburg 1899, p. 99.

4. Victor Leroquais, *Les Livres d'Heures, Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 3 vols, Paris 1927; Edmond Bishop, "On the Origin of the Primer," (*Liturgica Historica*, 1918, pp. 211-37).

5. J.-A. Bizet, *Henri Suso et le Déclin de la Scolastique*, Paris [1946], p. 78; Wilhelm Preger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Religiösen Bewegung in den Niederlanden in der 2. Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts*, Munich 1896, p. 450.

6. English translation by James M. Clark, *Little Book of Eternal Wisdom*, New York [1953], pp. 43-44.

7. Bizet, *op. cit.*, p. 396; Renée Zeller, *Le Serviteur de l'Eternelle Sagesse*, Paris [1922], p. 124.

8. Wilhelm Preger gives two extracts from the Latin Office of Divine Wisdom, together with parallel passages from the *Horologium* (*op. cit.*, pp. 450-1).

9. Preger, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

10. A. L. McMahon, *Catholic Encyclopedia*, VII, 239.

11. Text of letter published by Preger, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-37.

The Virginia and Richard Ehrlich Collection

THE Virginia and Richard Ehrlich Collection of manuscripts was established by an anonymous donor in 1949. The original gift included an extremely important autograph letter by George Washington, written at his headquarters in Cambridge on April 4, 1776, giving instructions to Major-General Artemus Ward for the military administration of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, and especially for the defense of Boston. A letter from Thomas Jefferson to William Rutledge (Paris, September 9, 1788) refuted Buffon's identification of the moose with the Lapland reindeer; and in another John Adams expressed his distress to Rufus King at the opposition in Massachusetts to a national navy. The English items included autograph letters by Isaac Walton, Samuel Richardson, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Sir Walter Scott, and others. Further documents were penned by Lorenzo de Medici, Luther, Beethoven, John James Audubon, Emerson, Longfellow, and William Cullen Bryant. The gift was described in detail in the January 1952 issue of this *Quarterly*.

During the next few years other notable manuscripts were added to the collection, such as the thirteenth-century document by Alfonso III, King of Aragon; a letter to the Bishop of Pesaro bearing the joint signature of François II of France and his Queen, Mary Stuart of Scotland. The earliest American piece among these gifts was a deed signed by Peter Stuyvesant, Governor General of the Colony of New Netherlands, granting property in the town of Fort Orange, as Albany was then called, to Evert Jansen of Emden. Robert Morris, a signer of the Declaration of Independence and the foremost financier of the American Revolution, wrote to Jonathan Hudson, a Baltimore merchant, on the subject of trade. Again there were numerous literary manuscripts, among them one by Tobias Smollett, another by Thomas DeQuincey, and still another by Mark Twain. The April 1956 issue of the *Quarterly* dealt with this group at some length.

There have since been further additions to the collection.

The present article is devoted to them. The letters and documents in the field of Americana include the marriage certificate of Edward Hutchinson and Lydia Foster (aunt and uncle of Thomas Hutchinson, Governor of the Bay Colony), signed by Increase Mather, and a sermon of Cotton Mather, preached on March 4, 1702, using the text of Ephesians I.3. On June 4, 1715, Samuel Sewall and his wife Hannah signed an indenture leasing to Joseph Belcher, for a period of seven years, five hundred acres of farmland on Hogg Island. The rent was sixty pounds a year, payable semi-annually; the property was stocked, when Belcher took over, with "7 oxen and steers, 2 horses, 1 mare, 8 cows, 120 sheep, 13 swine none under 6 months old, 2 stocks of bees, 1 cock turkey, 2 hens, 12 dunghill fowls, 1 boat with mast sails oars and road." A similar document notes the sale in 1795 by one John Adams of Campbell County, Virginia, of one hundred and five acres of land to Patrick Henry.

Among the other seventeenth- and eighteenth-century papers are a promissory note signed by William Penn in 1684; a request by Daniel Boone to "deliver to John Brinegin two and a half bushels"; and a similar note in the hand of Paul Revere. Thomas Paine, while clerk of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, copied out and signed an extract from the minutes of November 20, 1779 for Joseph Reed, President of the Executive Council.

Three items relate to John Brown, the abolitionist. One, by Brown to his wife, is date-lined Rockford, Illinois, 22nd May, 1855, a period not covered in Brown's two manuscript diaries owned by the Library. It reads:

Dear Wife, & Children

Last Night I received Watsons Letter of the 18th also Johns from Kansas enclosed with it; for all which I am very glad. Oliver has complained a little with Relax for a few days; but appears pretty well today. We are not yet sold out, but still hope we shall be soon. Brother Fredk is with us. He talks of leaving his cattle behind, (some Four or Five); & going home within a day or two. I shall close up with all speed, but cannot force people to buy. In haste

Your affectionate Husband

John Brown

At this time Brown was endeavoring to wind up his affairs, in order to take his wife and younger children from Akron, Ohio, back to North Elba, New York, in order that he might be free to join his elder sons who had just left for Kansas. Of the boys mentioned in the letter, Oliver, then sixteen, and Watson, twenty, were among those killed at Harper's Ferry.

One of the most liberal supporters of Brown was George Luther Stearns, a manufacturer of lead pipe in Boston. Shortly after Brown's execution on December 2, 1859, his widow thanked Stearns and his wife (Mary Elizabeth Preston, a niece of Lydia Maria Child) for their sympathy. She wrote from North Elba: "I have often heard my dear husband speak of your family. We shall be most happy to see you at our house any time you think best . . ." She went on to explain that William Thompson, also killed in the raid, was not a son-in-law; his wife, Mary Ann Brown, was not a relative. Ruth Brown Thompson, Brown's eldest daughter by his first wife, sent the following letter to Mrs. Stearns:

My Dear Friend:

Although personally unacquainted with you yet I do not feel that I am a stranger, for I have so often heard my dear Father speak of you and Mr. Stearns, as being his very dear friends, that helped him so much while he was in Kansas, and since he came from there. Also having had the pleasure of reading the letters from you & Mr. S. to my Mother, I have felt a desire to write you, that I might become better acquainted with you.

I was much interested in your excellent letter, so full of heart-felt sympathy for Mother, and respect for my dear lost Father. I copied his last letter to you, and every time I read it, I feel assured, that, in you & your husband we shall find warm friends.

You wrote that you wanted to come to North Elba and see his family. *We all want you to come.* If your health is too feeble to endure the cold & rough roads, when warm weather comes, we shall look for you. This is a beautiful country in the summer, and I think your health would improve, to come out here and stay a few weeks. Nothing would give us more pleasure, than to have Father's friends come and make us a visit, It would comfort us much to see you & Mr. Stearns, for we feel *very lonely now*. Oh I know you do sympathize with us, and realize to a great extent what a *loss is ours*. I can never think of my dear Father without feeling that his happy spirit is watching over me. But my dear Brothers,

& Brothers in law, I cannot realize that they are dead, it seems as though they would soon come, but Alas they too are gone.

Why did I say Alas; for I believe "they are angels in Heaven." I have a Mother there too. My little Ellie (not yet 4 years old) heard me say that my Father and Mother were dead, she answered quickly, "you can have Grand-mother for your Mother, Mama." Yes thought I, and her place is most kindly and affectionately filled. Were it not for the thought that my noble Father and Brothers, died in a *righteous cause* I could hardly endure it. It is very comforting to know that "God reigns."

Mother and all *our family* are well. Should be very happy to receive a letter from you. My husband joins me in love to you and *all yours*.

Your Affectionate friend . . .

Among the manuscripts of literary interest, the earliest is a note dated December 15, 1722, in which Jonathan Swift — or as he signs himself, "Jonath Swift Decan" — notified his clergy of a Chapter meeting at the Cathedral of St. Patrick. There is another letter by Tobias Smollett, addressed to his friend and biographer Dr. John Moore, a surgeon at Glasgow. Dated March 1, 1754, it has been printed except for the first sentence: "Dear John, By this time I suppose you have received a letter from me, by Mr. Straton, which will give you all the information which I can impart with regard to Tom Lewis's legacy, tho' I am afraid it was designed for Mr. Jas. Muir with whom I understand, he had some connexion."

An apparently unpublished letter by Hester Piozzi, the friend of Samuel Johnson, was written to Sir James Fellowes on December 10, 1815, thirty-one years after Johnson's death. Mrs. Piozzi had met Fellowes, a naval surgeon, some months earlier, at the home of a mutual friend, when she retired to Bath to spend her declining years. Although there was a considerable difference in age, the two were strongly attracted and carried on a spirited correspondence until Mrs. Piozzi's death. It was for Sir James that she wrote out a detailed autobiographical sketch, and he later became her literary executor. The letter begins without heading:

How kind you are and how partial! and what an unspeakable loss shall I have when you enter on a London Life and London Practice. Dr. Holland who writes about the Ionian Islands is

going to London to *practise* and exchange the *Cyclades* for the *sick Ladies*. He has been a Lyon here for three whole Days. I caught the *Queue du Lion* & pass'd one Evening in his Company . . . but a whole Menagerie would make me no Compensation for Exchange of Sentiment in Friendly Converse.

Oh do make haste to Bath and let me lament my Fate to you personally.

Is that being grateful to Heaven though? when *one* Year's valuable Friendship has been granted, at a Time when so few Years can be expected by

Poor H. L. Piozzi.

"Let us leave the best Example that we can." I have however much to say to you about the Biographical Memoires — which are really in some Degree of Forwardness.

The following day she wrote her friend a longer letter, published in Abraham Hayward's *Autobiography, Letters and Literary Remains of Mrs. Piozzi (Thrale)*. She began: "Very ill pleased with myself for sending such an empty scrap when my heart was full, but 'it was because your servant waited at the door for it . . . I sit down now to write you as long a letter as I like, and fairly send it to the post . . ."

There is a receipt by Louisa May Alcott for seventy-five dollars, received from Ticknor and Fields in September 1860, in payment for "A Modern Cinderella," published in *The Atlantic Monthly* in October of that year. Based on the wooing of her sister Anna by John Pratt, this was the second of the young author's stories to appear in that magazine. From a later period, dated only "April 19th," there is a letter by Miss Alcott to Thomas Niles (1825-94), a partner in the Roberts Brothers firm, publishers of *Little Women*. Describing an interview by a young reporter, she wrote:

. . . It was amusing to see how patiently he listened to my twaddle about every subject under the sun *but* L.M.A. & how skilfully he slipped in a question now & then which I had to answer whether I wanted to or not. On the whole I think he let me off pretty well, though a few facts were a little mixed & the low spirited cranky old lady appeared as a sunny, large eyed person of an angelic & dramatic turn. Never mind, let the dear, deluded public be happy . . .

George Bernard Shaw announced to "Dear Titterton" that

the occupants of his box for the opening night of a revival of *Major Barbara* (at Wyndham's Theater on March 5, 1929) would be Mrs. Shaw, Colonel Lawrence ("Lawrence of Arabia"), and Apsley Cherry-Garrard, "sole survivor of the terrible winter journey which was the worst part of Scott's Antarctic Expedition." "Whether I shall be present myself," he continued, "seems doubtful. I practically got out of bed to tackle those Saturday and Monday rehearsals; and I shall have to coddle myself for a day or two to avoid a relapse."

There are many short notes in the collection. Adam Smith, writing to William Strahan, his publisher, about a new Danish translation of his great work, remarked: "I had almost forgot that I was the author of the enquiry concerning the *Wealth of Nations*." In a note Thackeray confessed that he possessed none of his own books "except single copies of *Vanity Fair*, *Pendennis*, and *Esmond*"; a promissory note to William Taylor for 131 £ is signed by Richard Sheridan; Melville accepts an invitation to lecture; and Oscar Wilde writes, in April 1892, to Lewis Waller, the English actor-manager: "What would you give me for a Triple Bill? I would require a certain sum of money down, and a certain sum on completion — the money down to be returned if you don't like the plays . . . Make me an offer, if you care to, and be sure that it is a temptation — because I never resist temptation."

Nineteenth-century actors and actresses are represented by more than twenty autographs — a valuable addition to the Allen A. Brown Dramatic Collection, with its many portraits, clippings, and play-bills relating to the same persons. Typical is one from Ellen Terry to Augustine Daly, in which she complains that "after a long absence from England I find so very much to do, so many people to see, that I am *getting quite ill*, and am seriously considering the idea of going into some Hospital or Lunatic Asylum for a little rest and quiet!" Ada Rehan, vacationing at the English sea-side, writes an exuberant letter to a friend who is to join her: "Oh it is Heavenly here. We long so for the 30th. I want you to have this Air and Sun. It has been fine such a long time. I fear it may turn wild, and then the quiet is gone. It is all wind and rain . . . I know

London is too close to be good for you. So do keep well — for the Bungalow time. Sea gulls & Rabbits & such a Sighing Sea are all waiting.” Richard Mansfield comments to a friend, “I believe it is all rot about people not going to the theater in the summer — I know to the contrary — they don’t go because there’s nothing to go to see.”

Here, too, is a letter by Anton Dvořák concerning payment to the translator of *The Spectre’s Bride*: “He is wrong to require a sum for it. I found the German translation published in a daily newspaper. But in regards he is a very poor man with many children and a very clever man, then I think he deserves to be rewarded.” Writing in Prague in November 1885, the composer braved the English language: “Many, many thanks for sending me such a tasty full printed and bounded full score of my Spectres Bride and Hymns.” Henrik Ibsen, too, was troubled with translation problems. In his Norwegian he thanks an English book dealer for bringing his work to the attention of the English press, “which will make it easier perhaps to find a publisher. To begin a translation without a reasonable compensation for time as well as pleasure would be unfair.”

Turning finally to the European historical documents, one finds a long series bearing the signatures of French monarchs — Henri II, Charles VIII, IX, and X, and Louis XIII to Louis XVIII, Napoleon, and François I. Queen Elizabeth wrote in Latin to Baron von Anholt, seeking the release of Daniel Rogers, her “orator,” who, born in Germany but a naturalized citizen, was frequently engaged in diplomatic business in the Low Countries and Germany. It was on such a mission that Rogers was arrested upon the request of Philip II of Spain. Elizabeth wrote her letter in March 1581, but it took three more years before Rogers was released. Henry VIII is represented by an order to Sir Andrew Wyndson, “Knight Keeper of our great Wardrobe,” for livery for his groom George Duckworth, requiring “eighteen yerde of chamblet for a gowne . . . eight yerdes of damasks . . . three yerde of Velvet.” From October 14, 1626 dates a document in which Charles I granted a gift of land to Sir Henry Vane, father of the unfortunate Massachusetts governor whom Charles II executed.

Louise I. Guiney on American Woman Poets

ON January 10, 1901, a few weeks after she had resigned her position in the Catalogue Department of the Boston Public Library to make arrangements for her departure to London, Louise Imogen Guiney received a book from England. A letter in advance had told her what to expect — an anthology of American sacred songs compiled by the sender, the Reverend William Garrett Horder, Congregational minister and hymnologist, and published in 1900 under the title of *Treasury*; a song by Miss Guiney would be found in the volume.

Although her poems had been selected for all kinds of anthologies prior to this date (starting with *Representative Poems of Living Poets*, New York, 1886), Miss Guiney reacted as if someone, at last, had discovered her talents.¹ What really pleased her was that she had found another friend among the clergy, and she wondered who had set Mr. Horder on her "humble trail," suspecting immediately another clergyman, the Reverend Alexander Smellie of Carluke, Lanarkshire, Scotland, or more probably her friends Katherine Tynan and her husband Henry Alfred Hinkson, neighbors of Horder in Ealing.

The book led naturally to an exchange of books and letters. Nine letters of Miss Guiney to her new friend, written in 1901 and 1902, are in the Louise Imogen Guiney Collection in the Dinand Library of Holy Cross College; two of them are printed here.

Horder, Miss Guiney soon discovered, was "greatly prejudiced in favor of things American." American woman poets were one of his interests, and he asked her to name and comment on those in the front rank. The first of the two letters is Miss Guiney's response to this request: a deft but sympathetic sketch of six outstanding American woman poets at the turn of the century. She did not, of course, include herself.

The second letter was written shortly after Mr. Horder and his wife had arrived in Boston on a visit to the United States. Miss Guiney had supplied them with letters of introduction to her Boston friends, and this letter briefed the couple on these

friends — the Roberts of Cambridge, Congregationalists as were the Horders; William Hayes Ward, the editor of *The Independent* (and also a Congregationalist minister, though Miss Guiney does not mention it); Fred Holland Day, Alice Brown, and Edward B. Hunt, her dear friend and colleague in the Catalogue Department of the Library. A special task had been assigned to Hunt — to give the Horders a conducted tour of “one of the very first American ‘sights’”: the Boston Public Library.

Words inserted above the line by Miss Guiney have been bracketed. She wrote the first letter in one paragraph.

William L. Lucey, S.J.

12 Walton Street, Oxford.
4 Feb’y, 1902.

Dear Mr. Horder:

Your queries should have been answered at once, had not a little illness of my Aunt’s, (now happily past) kept me from pen and ink for nearly a week. I’ll tell you the very little I can about the young women — poets I know, whom you mention.

Edith Thomas stands first, this long while, in American estimation. Born in the West a little over forty years ago, I should say, but now lives, and has lived for some time, in Staten Island, New York. Is very shy, and something of an invalid; and looks, or used to look, like — Keats! H. M. & Co., I think, are her publishers.

Helen Gray Cone is my favorite: a New Yorker, a teacher of literature, who has never had the ‘swing’ her splendid talent needs. She has as classical a temper as Miss Thomas, but ever so much more body, and more [human] fire. Don’t know any American poetry to beat some things in her book called “The Ride to the Lady.”

Lizette Woodworth Reese is a Southerner and a Celt. She is unique [as being] by far the best landscape-poet of her generation. She has a reticent touch, delicate and mystical. Lives in Baltimore, teaches, and is fair to see.

Hannah Parker Kimball is a Bostonian, a great friend of mine, and a born Transcendentalist. She is the “philosophical head” among us, does better work every year, and has all worldly advantages in the way of leisure, independent fortune &c., to help

her bring out the best that is in her. You can get her two books, 'Soul & Sense,' and 'Victory,' from Small & Maynard, Boston. She is now in Italy, and has a new volume nearly ready.

Alice Brown, also [my friend and] a Bostonian (by residence, not by birth) is very much the least known of these as a poet; but she has a fine [national] reputation as a writer of short stories of New England common life. However, as Mr. Archer has taken a fancy to her one little book of verse ('The Road to Arcady,'¹ H. M. & Co.) and put her, alone of American women, into his Anthology, she bids fair to be known now. She is a nice artist in words, always. Like Miss Kimball, she is of Puritan stock, knowing England well [and] follows no religion, though of rather a religious temperament.

A newer and younger than any of these, is Josephine Preston Peabody, who has published, through H. M. & Co. (the usual channel, you see!) some dramas in poetic form; also a book of lyrics, [to be had of] Small, Maynard & Co. Some excellent judges delight in her work.² It is not of the clear-cut sort which you can quote, like Miss Cone or Miss Kimball. This exhausts, I think, our list of "poetesses," (as all the English say, save you), who are worth while.

Yours,
L. I. Guiney.

Dear Mr. Horder:

I can but hope (in the dark), that you and Mrs. Horder had the smoothest of voyages, and are rested, and beginning to enjoy our exhilarating old U.S.A. These few letters may give you, eventually, a bit of extra pleasure[s]. The Roberts family are sheep of your own fold, who have travelled in England and are well-read, (though not poetical!) and made up of human charm and human goodness. The two lovely girls are of Radcliffe College, the women's "Harvard Annex", as it used to be called. I am sure you may ask them to do everything and anything in the way of showing you Cambridge, if indeed that be not all over and done with before Col. Higginson sees the last of you. Pray give him a most affectionate greeting from me.

Mr. Hunt is Chief of the Catalogue at our splendid Boston Public Library, which is one of the very first American 'sights'. He is a little man with a big voice, as clever as he can possibly be, most genial and charming; and he is a great friend of mine,

and will be glad indeed to know you, and take you all over the Library. So pray don't go there beforehand with any one else! Mrs. Day of Norwood is the mother of a Boston litterateur, Mr. F. Holland Day, who is almost my oldest friend, and used to be my publisher. He is a great bibliophile, [fond of England, and the English,] and has a wonderful library, and a Keats collection which is only second to Sir C. Dilke's. Just now his hobby is amateur photography, in which he works miracles. He knows all our younger poets well, and would gladly put you in the way of meeting some of them. I am sorry to say (but ask Mr. Day further about this), that Mr. W. V. Moody, to the best of my present knowledge, is in Virginia³; and [Miss] Alice Brown is much pre-occupied with an invalid friend, and practically goes nowhere. Her address is 96 Chestnut St., Boston. I have no doubt she would call on you and Mrs. Horder, if you ask her to. Do tell her that I told you so, although I know she does not appear at "functions" &c. She is a fascinatingly nice human being, whom you would like. She and I were over here in 1895 together, and have been out at Ealing to dine and sup with the Hinksons.

Canon Wilton's book is most lovely, from cover to cover.⁴ I was delighted to have such a gift, and felt that it was you who gave him my address. I have taken it for granted that you knew my ever dear Dr. William Hayes Ward, or will do so immediately, by better agencies than mine? Pray salute him [for me,] and 'Professor Van Dyke' too, as Canon Wilton calls him. Dr. Ward could summon up Bliss Carman 'from the vaster deep,' if you yearn for that inestimable and tow-headed spirit.

With all cordial remembrances to Mrs. Horder, and heartiest wishes for your joint holiday, I am

Very faithfully yours,

Louise I. Guiney.

Apr. 21, 1902. 12 Walton St., Oxford.

Notes

1. One will find anthologies with contributions by Miss Guiney in the section on her in *Bibliography of American Literature*, compiled by Jacob Blanck (Yale University Press, 1950), III, 316-18. Horder's *Treasury* is not listed there.

2. Miss Guiney meant *The Road to Castaly* (Boston: Copeland and Day, 1896); she should have remembered the title since the book is dedicated to her. Her reference is to William Archer, *Poets of the Younger Generation* (London and New York, 1902), 60-65.

3. Fred Holland Day, mentioned in the second letter, sent Miss Guiney a copy of Josephine Peabody's *The Singing Man A Book of Songs and Shadows* (Boston and New York, 1911) with this inscription: "I do hope Josephine hasn't sent you one herself—!" Copy in the Louise Imogen Guiney Room, Dinand Library, Holy Cross College.

4. Miss Guiney knew this because she had recently received from Moody a copy of his *The Masque of Judgment* (Boston: Small, Maynard & Company, 1900) with the inscription dated: "Cape Henry Light, Virginia/March 27, 1902." Copy in the Louise Imogen Guiney Room.

5. This was probably Wilton's *Lyra Pastoralis: Songs of Nature, Church, and Home* (London, Methuen, 1902).

Etchings and Drawings of Arthur W. Heintzelman

By ROBERT TAYLOR

IT is seemly that Arthur W. Heintzelman's etchings and drawings should be exhibited in the Albert H. Wiggin Gallery at the zenith of a distinguished career. His position as an authoritative figure of scholarship is established; at the Boston Public Library he has created a unique and profound life-work dedicated to his medium; now, it is appropriate to be reminded that the basis of his impressive achievement has always resided in the sensitive perceptions of a major artist.

Few men of our time — indeed, of any period — have enriched print-making to such an extent as Heintzelman. His first Boston display took place at Goodspeed's in 1917. Then twenty-seven years old, he already possessed international reputation; he was known to connoisseurs and collectors, and the splendid Paris catalogue of his works with its appreciation by Campbell Dodgson of the British Museum was only a few years away.

Within recent years, however, the art world has tended to regard Heintzelman as a curator, overlooking the magnitude of his personal *oeuvre*. There are many reasons for this blind spot. His critical philosophy and painstaking research represent a standard in contemporary art. He has been mistakenly identified with a school of print-makers in the trough of fashion. He never sought the limelight, preferring to develop an art that should be modest, comely, honest, and pure.

That he was succeeded is triumphantly attested to by the Wiggin Gallery display at the Library. The exhibit restates the major themes engaging the artist over a period of a half century: the strongly-accentuated human types from wide-ranging social levels, his concern with childhood and the family, the religious subjects, landscape, and a refined poetic order.

The conviction of Heintzelman's etchings and drawings as a concept has its counterpart in his involvement with method. His techniques are guided by the fundamentals of the copper-plate mediums, the line-drawing, to a formidable degree. As

Robert Rey of the Luxembourg Museum has stated: "One would search in vain on his etched plate, bitten by the acid with cutting precision, for the little stroke with grayish edges due to a going-over by the needle." He has steeped himself in the essential disciplines of his craft, so that his style, like his master's, Rembrandt, becomes a vehicle of direct communication. With Heintzelman we pass beyond the point where method obtrudes as virtuosity; we are in contact with a delicately-balanced fusion of form and content.

His method, however, is usually formalized, observing the classical conventions of design and draughtsmanship. Rather than creating a new order of reality (a principal concern of experimentally-minded 20th-century art), the artist's inspiration springs from his reasoned interpretation of nature. Eschewing the novel, he takes what might well be the more original course: to explore the levels of inarticulate reality beneath the sensory impression.

No artist of our era, for example, has been capable of penetrating the secret garden of childhood with more assurance. If Mary Cassatt gives us the relationship between parent and child, Arthur Heintzelman works directly from the sitter to present the subject against the implications of time. The child is not the father of the man in his work, but a self-contained individual existing in an exquisite moment of freshness that is all the more moving because of its transitory cadence.

He is equally persuasive in his treatment of old age and of the European peasant, two subjects that again demand the ability to relate oneself to a milieu with many moats and virtually no portcullis. The portrait of the "Grandmère Forain" (no kin to the etcher) repays infinite study for its concentration on essentials; and is also a statement of the isolate pride and rugged will of the human condition. The "Valaison" contains the subtle half-tones and boldly-proportioned three-quarter structure of a vivid figure composition; and sums up the knotty suspicion, lurking brute strength, and enormous capacity for endurance of an entire class.

It will be noticed that, beyond the contours and value contrasts of this art, exists an element of pathos, of tenderness. This is particularly evident in the scenes of French low-life.



*The "Valaison," an Etching by Arthur W. Heintzelman
(Greatly Reduced)*

The street singers, cabaret artists, and vagabonds depicted show an aspect of lonely and poignant individuality at a long remove from the topical social background. They are observed with sentiment.

True sentiment — the ability to feel intuitive potential — is extremely rare in art. Heintzelman's portraits of celebrated personalities, Dr. Schweitzer, Toscanini, the Swiss writer Ramuz, are notable for their psychological acumen; but, as with subject matter drawn from ordinary mankind, the etcher searches out a meaning, generally optimistic and affirmative. What are these people like as human beings? Heintzelman finds them good. As so much inferior art indicates, this is a strikingly dangerous conclusion; but no less valid for that. The tact and discrimination with which the artist conveys his attitude is an expression of the felicities of a restrained style — and of the accumulated and scrupulous values of civilization raised to its highest pitch.

The religious prints do not lend themselves so well to the detailed rendering which suits Heintzelman best, because the traditional iconography carries an esthetic implication inevitably bringing one back to Rembrandt. After the latter it is virtually impossible to create an imagery that should not evoke comparison. Nevertheless Heintzelman has approached the task of creating a significant personal religious view by using the methods of naturalism; and he has produced a body of Christian religious prints ranking with the finest of the contemporary genre. The rhythmic flow of line in "Golgotha" and the fascinating shrouded shapes of "The Entombment" project the deep-seated passions of belief.

Thus, Heintzelman's credo has been one of belief in a sceptical and rational age. He is an artist of the Graeco-Roman heritage who uses the tools of logical order to construct an art transcending the logical. Belief in discipline, in craft, in man inevitably leads to a belief in divine purpose in his work. His art is a celebration of the inherent dignity and noble scope of humanity; it will be treasured for its linear mastery; and, for its assertion of value against the fractured and tragic present, it will last.

Notes on Rare Books and Manuscripts

MRS. HAWTHORNE ON DICKENS

DICKENS'S first reading in Boston was given at the Tremont Temple on Monday evening, December 2, 1867. For a full description of the event see Edward F. Payne, *Dickens Days in Boston* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927), pp. 186 ff. Sophia Peabody Hawthorne, widow of Nathaniel Hawthorne, came in from Concord to attend the reading with two of her children, Julian and Rose, as the guest of the Boston publisher James T. Fields and his wife.

In the Boston Public Library there is a letter from Mrs. Hawthorne to Mrs. Fields which, to the best of my knowledge, has not previously been printed. It is dated only "Wednesday eve," which presumably indicates Wednesday, December 4, 1867. The letter, printed here with the permission of Mr. Manning Hawthorne, reads as follows:

Wednesday eve

Dearest Annie

How kind of you to be so prompt with my chattels. And you so full of engagements and guests. I have enjoyed my visit to you immensely. I am too tired to write how much this eve. I did not get home till nearly seven. I hope you had the refreshment of seeing Mr Dickens today after lesser lights cleared from your path. I hope you gave my love to him. That beautiful smile of sympathy with the audience's enjoyment was captivating.

Mrs. Hemenway insisted upon my dining with her, saying she would send me to the station in her carriage, if I would, and by that means I was enabled to do a justice to Mr Dickens. For it had been supposed or considered an evidence of foppishness that he came to the second part of the reading with a new bouquet in his button hole! Oh then what joy was mine to tell the lovely story of the English lady's bouquet. The story was received with equal joy and acclamation, Amy's beautiful eyes swimming in shining tears.

My Persian Rose, I fear you will get too tired to endure, before the departure of Mr Dickens. As for me, just one evening of him has made me live so fast that I am tired away into the future, so that I do not know how I am to rest. Yet it did me a world of good to hear and see him.

"Write him down [as] one who loves his fellow men."

The Express man put the trunk into the entry and ran. But I hope to catch him in the morning and then I will put in a book or two borrowed of you dear

Your loving friend
Sophia H

On May 24, 1868, Mrs. Hawthorne wrote Mrs. Fields from Brattleboro, Vermont, a letter (also in the Boston Public Library) which contained further reference to Dickens:

Now I have got hold of you again [she began]. Your last letter is wonderful. You do not know how well you have sketched the Great Actor and Man, and so you are rewarded for your kind effort to render him to me. You think it is nothing, but it is very much. Ever since Mr Fields told me in England or coming over the sea about his life and domestic affairs, I have seen and known that he was not justly regarded by the party which is against him in London. But you give me a still sweeter picture, which harmonizes beautifully with the tender humanity of his books. How fortunate it was for him that he had you both to come to, and to shelter himself with, so as not to be set upon and demolished by the eager, rabid Americans, who have no mercy upon a famous person.

It should be noted that Dickens is not named in this portion of the letter, though the reference to him seems inescapable. (He had sailed for England on April 22.) Later in the letter Mrs. Hawthorne says: "Will you then read me some of Mr Dickens' letters! How very delightful. I am sure I should appreciate it."

These letters, interesting on any account, gain in interest, it seems to me, in view of recent and current interest in Dickens's domestic affairs.

EDWARD WAGENKNECHT

A Book of Hours from Vrelant's Workshop

ANOTHER recent addition to the Library's collection of medieval Books of Hours is a Flemish manuscript produced probably in the workshop of Willem Vrelant, master miniaturist of Bruges. The volume follows the Use of Rome, and was written and illustrated between 1470 and 1480.

Willem Vrelant was born at Utrecht early in the fifteenth century, but his active life was spent at Bruges where he was in 1454

one of the founders of the local Confraternity of scribes and miniaturists. A neighbor and friend of Memlinc, in 1478 he arranged for the painting of an altar-piece by the latter, which he donated to the Confraternity. Although there are only a few works which can be positively identified as Vrelant's, documentary evidence and critical study prove his execution of a number of important volumes for Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, such as a series of sixty miniatures in a copy of the *Chronique du Hainaut*, a Breviary, and a Life of Saint Catherine.

The work is small, measuring only $4\frac{1}{4}$ by $3\frac{3}{8}$ inches. The text runs to seventeen lines on a page. The border decorations, which appear on or opposite those pages which contain the miniatures, consist of delicate gold and blue flowers and foliage. There are three full-page miniatures in color, and five smaller miniatures and twenty-six historiated initials in *grisaille* (a grey monochrome with tiny touches of gold and color). The small miniatures and initials are especially noteworthy; the artist has filled every millimeter of his little spaces with life and vigor.

The large miniatures show the Virgin and Child, the Annunciation, and the Last Judgment. The first of these is charming — the Virgin, in a golden robe and grey cloak, is seated with the Child on a massive gilt throne, with a green and blue canopy above. They are entertained by two angels, one with a pipe, the other strumming a zither, while an angora cat looks on. Pale archways to right and left of the throne give an impression of vast and mysterious depths beyond. In the scene of the Annunciation, the angel with colorful blue and red wings appears to the Virgin who is dressed in a rich white robe. Behind, a russet screen with gilt decorations gives a sense of intimacy, yet above it appear the arches and clerestories of a great Gothic cathedral. In the background of the Last Judgment there is a blue lake bordered with trees; on high stands Christ the Judge, with four angels sounding the trumpet.

The small miniatures are of the four Evangelists with their symbols (St. Luke's ox is transformed into a gazelle, and St. John is seated on a desert island), and of St. Bernard treading on a devil. The historiated initials in the Hours of the Virgin are of the usual subjects. There is room for only a brief description of these small miniatures. In general the ground is colored a soft olive green, with distant trees and the sky a pale blue; against this background is painted the delicate and skilfully drawn figures of the Saints in shades of grey and white, with an occasional accent note in red, as the trappings of St. Martin's horse or the breast-plate of St.

Adrian. The subjects themselves are conventional, yet the artist has included touches that add a special charm.

The text is in Latin, and contains no vernacular prayers or verses, such as those described in the article on the Book of Hours of Rennes (in the October 1957 issue of this *Quarterly*). Neither does it contain heraldic devices, portraits, or other pictorial clues to indicate the original owner. The small size and costliness of the volume, however, suggest a wealthy lady. The Calendar contains the names of many saints peculiar to the vicinity of Bruges: Saints Basil, Giles, Amand, Eligius, Aldegundis, Eleutherius, and Hubert, to name a few.

The volume comprises 206 vellum leaves, with missing leaves at the beginnings of the Office of the Holy Cross, Office of the Holy Spirit, and Office of the Dead. Presumably three full-page miniatures are missing at these points.

A striking unorthodoxy of the text are the Eight Verses of St. Bernard. The Abbé Victor Leroquais in his standard work *Les Livres d'Heures: Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Vol. I, xxx-xxxi) states that this prayer is one of the many superstitious elements which crept into the Books of Hours. According to him, the Verses of St. Bernard have their origin in the following legend:

One day the devil met St. Bernard and said to him; "I know seven verses from the Psalter of such efficacy that anyone who will recite them surely will never be damned." "And what are these verses?" asked St. Bernard, "make them known to me right away." "Never," replied the devil, "you will not know them." "Oh," returned St. Bernard, "I will find a good means of overcoming that difficulty; that will be to recite the entire Psalter." The devil, in order to prevent his doing such a good deed, revealed to him the seven verses in question. And in regard to the third verse — *Locutus sum in lingua mea, notum fac michi, Domine, finem meum; et numerum dierum meorum quis est ut sciam quid desit michi.* (Lord, make me to know mine end, and the measure of my days, what it is; that I may know how frail I am) — we are told, that it was of such an efficacy that to anyone who recited it every day God revealed the day and the hour of his death.

The Abbé Leroquais goes on to say that this seemingly innocent prayer, consisting of verses from the Psalter, is doubly harmful because of the power which is attributed to it. In the Library's volume the third verse is repeated, making eight verses.

MARY CASTELLANO

Trustees of the Library

ERWIN D. CANHAM, *President*

SIDNEY R. RABB, *Vice-President*

FRANK W. BUXTON

PATRICK F. McDONALD

RIGHT REVEREND EDWARD G. MURRAY

Director, and Librarian

MILTON EDWARD LORD

Contributors to this Issue

CHARLES R. CROWE is on the staff of Cedar Crest College at Allentown, Pennsylvania.

EDWARD WAGENKNECHT is Professor of English at Boston University.

WILLIAM L. LUCEY, S.J., is Librarian of the College of the Holy Cross at Worcester, Massachusetts.

ROBERT TAYLOR is music and art critic of the Boston *Herald*.

ELLEN M. OLDHAM is Reference Librarian of the Rare Book Department; and ARTHUR W. HEINTZELMAN, etcher and painter, is Keeper of Prints at the Boston Public Library.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 07982 269 6

